

TEXTUAL AND HERMENEUTICAL ASPECTS  
OF PAUL'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT  
IN 1 AND 2 CORINTHIANS

Robert Bruce Hughes

Ph. D.

University of Edinburgh

1978



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
STATEMENT OF INTEGRITY . . . . .	ix
ABSTRACT . . . . .	x
ABBREVIATIONS . . . . .	xii

### PART I

TEXTUAL AND CONCEPTUAL VECTORS . . . . .	1
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
THE FOCUS OF THE STUDY . . . . .	1
OTHER DISCIPLINES RELATIVE TO THE OT IN	
1 AND 2 CORINTHIANS . . . . .	3
COMPARATIVE INFERENCES . . . . .	6
THE CENTRALITY OF THE GREEK OT . . . . .	7
AIMS OF THE STUDY . . . . .	9
TEXTUAL VECTORS . . . . .	12
ORAL AND WRITTEN TRADITION IN FIRST	
CENTURY PALESTINE . . . . .	12
Memory And Tradition . . . . .	12
Birger Gerhardsson . . . . .	12
Criticism . . . . .	15
Memory And Quotation . . . . .	19
Summary . . . . .	21



LXX TRANSMISSION-HISTORY IN FIRST CENTURY	
PALESTINE . . . . .	22
Recent Methodology . . . . .	22
Translations, Targums and Recensions . .	22
Dead Sea Contributions . . . . .	23
Description Of The Methodology . . . . .	25
Theodotion . . . . .	25
The Book of Reigns . . . . .	27
The Local Text Theory . . . . .	28
Deliniation Of Old Greek Strata . . . . .	31
Deliniation Of Καὶ γὰρ . . . . .	34
Christian Interpolation . . . . .	36
CONCEPTUAL VECTORS . . . . .	41
JEWISH EXEGESIS IN FIRST CENTURY PALESTINE . . .	41
Definition Of Terminology . . . . .	41
Identification Of Midrashic Exegesis . . . .	43
Chronological Relationships . . . . .	47
Dating of the Sources . . . . .	48
Midrashic Literature . . . . .	55
Mishnaic Literature . . . . .	55
Formal Relationships . . . . .	56
Conceptual Relationships . . . . .	59
World View . . . . .	59
Conceptual Determinants . . . . .	61
The Mekilta . . . . .	62
Religious Tradition . . . . .	63
Conclusion . . . . .	66

MODERN EXEGESIS IN OT IN NT STUDIES . . . . .	69
Introduction . . . . .	69
Harnack (1928) And Michel (1929) . . . . .	69
Goppelt (1939) . . . . .	72
Dodd (1952) . . . . .	74
Ellis (1957) . . . . .	75
Lindars (1961) And Dietzfelbinger (1961) . . .	75
Braun (1962) . . . . .	78
Ulonska (1963) . . . . .	79
Summary . . . . .	81
Conclusion . . . . .	82

## PART II

TEXTUAL AND HERMENEUTICAL EVIDENCES . . . .	86
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	86
PENTATEUCH . . . . .	88
GENESIS . . . . .	88
Genesis 2:7, 1 Corinthians 15:45 . . . . .	88
Genesis 2:24, 1 Corinthians 6:16 . . . . .	100
EXODUS . . . . .	106
Exodus 16:18, 2 Corinthians 8:15 . . . . .	106
Exodus 32:6, 1 Corinthians 10:7 . . . . .	113
Exodus 34:34, 2 Corinthians 3:16 . . . . .	119
LEVITICUS . . . . .	135
Leviticus 26:11-12, 2 Corinthians 6:16-18,	
Isaiah 52:11, 2 Samuel 7:14 . . . . .	135

NUMBERS . . . . .	155
Numbers 14:16, 1 Corinthians 10:5 . . . . .	155
DEUTERONOMY . . . . .	167
Deuteronomy 19:15, 2 Corinthians 13:1 . . . . .	167
Deuteronomy 22:24, 1 Corinthians 5:13 . . . . .	174
Deuteronomy 25:4, 1 Corinthians 9:9 . . . . .	180
Deuteronomy 32:17, 1 Corinthians 10:20 . . . . .	192
JOB, PSALMS, PROVERBS . . . . .	196
JOB . . . . .	196
Job 5:13, Psalm 94:11 (93:11 LXX),	
1 Corinthians 3:19-20 . . . . .	196
PSALMS . . . . .	210
Psalm 8:6 (8:7 LXX & MT), 1 Corinthians 15:27	210
Psalm 24:1 (23:1 LXX), 1 Corinthians 10:26 .	213
Psalm 110:1 (109:1 LXX), 1 Corinthians 15:25	218
Psalm 112:9 (111:9 LXX), 2 Corinthians 9:9 .	224
Psalm 116:10 (115:1 LXX), 2 Corinthians 4:13	230
PROVERBS . . . . .	236
Proverbs 3:4, 2 Corinthians 8:21 . . . . .	236
Proverbs 22:9 (:8a LXX), 2 Corinthians 9:7 .	240
ISAIAH . . . . .	243
ISAIAH 22:13, 1 CORINTHIANS 15:32 . . . . .	243
ISAIAH 25:8, HOSEA 13:14, 1 CORINTHIANS	
15:54-55 . . . . .	246
ISAIAH 28:11-12, 1 CORINTHIANS 14:21 . . . . .	257
ISAIAH 29:14, 1 CORINTHIANS 1:19 . . . . .	267
ISAIAH 40:13, 1 CORINTHIANS 2:16 . . . . .	285

ISAIAH 45:14, 1 CORINTHIANS 14:25 . . . . .	296
ISAIAH 49:8, 2 CORINTHIANS 6:2 . . . . .	300
ISAIAH 49:13, 2 CORINTHIANS 7:6 . . . . .	306
ISAIAH 55:10, HOSEA 10:12, 2 CORINTHIANS 9:10 . .	309
ISAIAH 64:4 (64:3 MT), 1 CORINTHIANS 2:9 . . . .	316
JEREMIAH . . . . .	341
JEREMIAH 9:24 (9:23 LXX), 1 CORINTHIANS 1:31 . .	341
JEREMIAH 9:24, 2 CORINTHIANS 10:17 . . . . .	351
TEXTUAL DISTINCTIONS IN 1 AND 2 CORINTHIANS . . . .	353
1 CORINTHIANS . . . . .	353
Summary Of Textual Evidence . . . . .	353
Textual Similarities . . . . .	359
2 CORINTHIANS . . . . .	361
Summary Of Textual Evidence . . . . .	361
Textual Similarities . . . . .	367
Conclusion . . . . .	368

### PART III

CONCEPTUAL AND TEXTUAL CONCLUSIONS . . . .	370
CONCEPTUAL CONTINUITY BETWEEN THE TESTAMENTS . . . .	371
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	371
THE PERSON AND ACTS OF GOD . . . . .	372
THE PLAN OF GOD . . . . .	374
Jesus As The Christ . . . . .	375
Introduction . . . . .	375
The Resurrection Of The Christ . . . . .	377
The Damascus Road Experience of Paul . .	378

A Ground for Interpretation . . . . .	380
The New Way of Salvation . . . . .	383
The Church as the New Israel . . . . .	385
The Reign of Messiah . . . . .	386
CONTINUATION OF OT PIETY . . . . .	386
TYPOLOGY . . . . .	387
SPIRIT AND LETTER . . . . .	398
Summary . . . . .	403
TEXT FORMULATIONS IN THE PRE-PAULINE CHRISTIAN	
TRADITION . . . . .	404
TESTIMONIES . . . . .	404
Methodology . . . . .	404
Testimonies In 1 And 2 Cor. . . . .	408
THE TEXT-PLOT THEORY . . . . .	409
Text-Plots In 1 And 2 Cor.. . . .	414
INDICATIONS OF A PALESTINIAN GREEK OT IN	
1 AND 2 CORINTHIANS . . . . .	412
Textual Affinities According To The Old	
Testament Book . . . . .	418
Isaiah . . . . .	418
Hosea . . . . .	423
Ezekiel 37:27 (2 Cor. 6:16) . . . . .	425
Proverbs . . . . .	425
Job . . . . .	425
Psalms . . . . .	425
2 Samuel . . . . .	426
Pentateuchal Quotations . . . . .	426

Conclusions . . . . .	427
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	432
BOOKS . . . . .	432
PERIODICALS . . . . .	459
UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS . . . . .	478

## STATEMENT OF INTEGRITY

I, Robert B. Hughes affirm that the work in this thesis was researched, compiled and written in both rough and final forms by myself alone under the guidance of my supervisors.

## ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Part I presents the textual and conceptual vectors which form the background to the specific examination of the OT in 1 and 2 Cor. The first aim is to discern the original OT text-forms in order to conclude what was or was not a Pauline alteration. Septuagintal transmission-history in first century Palestine is discussed in the light of recent methodological advances made by Barthélemy, Cross and others. The paper follows, in the main, the established positions of Barthélemy and Tov. The second aim concerns why Paul selected and, in several cases, edited the OT texts. Oral and written tradition in Palestine is examined by interaction with the critical debates centered on the works of Gerhardsson and others. Distinctions between literary form and exegetical method are made in view of possible anachronistic errors when comparing early Christianity with Judaism and Rabbinics. Part I concludes by surveying nine major works specifically concerning Paul's use of the OT. A caveat arises to consider Paul's own usage apart from the imposition of a later critical method.

Part II contains the detailed observation of the textual and hermeneutical evidences. Organized by OT



books, each passage is examined on textual, contextual and hermeneutical levels. A cumulative perspective of Paul's textual bases and hermeneutical methods and conceptualities emerges.

Part III presents the textual and conceptual conclusions. Hermeneutically, Paul shows a consistent tendency to use the OT for more than anti-Judaistic polemic (Lindars) or simple illustration (Ulonka). The basis of his use was an historical understanding of the OT. Paul's conceptuality displays a continuity of deity and piety from the OT to the NT. The conclusions of Harnack, Dodd, Lindars, Braun and others concerning Paul's concepts of continuity are evaluated in this light. The paper concludes with an elaboration of possible indications of a Palestinian Greek OT in 1 and 2 Cor. Textually, Paul shows positive evidence for a Palestinian Greek OT divergent from the LXX. In the absence of evidence from Qumran, Paul's OT text-forms provide early evidence for the state of the Greek OT in Palestine.

## ABBREVIATIONS

A&G	Arndt and Gingrich
AJSL	The American Journal Of Semitic Languages
BT	The Bible Today
Bib.	Biblica
BA	Biblical Archaeologist
BTB	Biblical Theology Bulletin
BASOR	Bulletin Of The American Schools Of Oriental Research
BHK	Biblia Hebraica Kittel
BHS	Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (Fascicles, where available)
BJRL	Bulletin Of The John Rylands Library
BS	Bibliotheca Sacra
B-M	Brooke-McLean
BZ	Biblische Zeitschrift
CS	Cahiers Sioniens
CTJ	Calvin Theological Journal
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
ChT	Christianity Today
CV	Communio Viatorum
CTM	Concordia Theological Monthly
EQ	Evangelical Quarterly
Ex	Expositor

ET	Expository Times
GLXX	The Göttingen Septuagint
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
IF	Introductory Formula(ae)
Int.	Interpretation
Ist.	Istina
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review
JBL	Journal Of Biblical Literature
JETS	Journal Of The Evangelical Theological Society
JR	Journal Of Religion
JSS	Journal Of Semitic Studies
JSJ	Journal For The Study Of Judaism
JTS	Journal Of Theological Studies
JT	Journal Of Theology
JTVI	Journal Of The Transactions Of The Victoria Institute
Jud.	Judaica
K-B	Koehler-Baumgartner
KD	Kerygma Und Dogma
KR	<u>KAIGE</u> Recension
LS	Liddell and Scott
LXX	Septuagint
M&G	Moulton and Geden
M&M	Moulton and Milligan
MT	Masoretic Text
NTS	New Testament Studies

NRT	Nouvelle Revue Théologique
NT	Novum Testamentum
RSR	Recherches De Science Religieuse
RR	Reformed Review
RB	Revue Biblique
RHE	Revue D'Histoire Ecclésiastique
RQ	Revue De Qumran
RSPT	Revue Des Sciences Philosophiques Et Théologiques
S	Semeia
S-B	Strack-Billerbeck
SJT	Scottish Journal Of Theology
SMR	Studia Montis Regii
SLXX	Swete. <u>The Old Testament In Greek</u>
T&U	Texte Und Untersuchungen
T	Textus
TEH	Theologische Existenz Heute
TL	Theologische Literaturzeitung
TZ	Theologische Zeitschrift
Th	Theology
TD	Theology Digest
TB	Tyndale Bulletin
VT	Vetus Testamentum
ZAW	Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZNW	Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZTK	Zeitschrift Für Theologie Und Kirche
ZWT	Zeitschrift Für Wissenschaftliche Theologie

# Standard abbreviations for the Greek strata of Samuel-Kings:<sup>1</sup>

## Thackeray's divisions:

$\alpha$  = 1 Sam.

$\beta\beta$  = 2 Sam. 1:1-11:1

$\beta\gamma$  = 2 Sam. 11:2-Kgs. 2:11

$\gamma\gamma$  = 1 Kgs. 2:12-21:43

$\gamma\delta$  = 1 Kgs. 22 plus 2 Kgs.

Ant(iochian) recension = MSS  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  in  $\beta\gamma$  and  $\gamma\delta$

Pal(estinian) recension =  $\kappa\alpha\lambda\gamma\epsilon$  recension  
(=KR [Shenkel])

$\sigma'$  Symmachus

$\alpha'$  Aquila

$\vartheta'$  Theodotion

$\neq$  "Does not equal"

---

<sup>1</sup>IOSCS, p. 2, 1972 Kraft, ed.

PART I  
TEXTUAL AND CONCEPTUAL VECTORS  
INTRODUCTION  
THE FOCUS OF THE STUDY

A continual need of the careful exegete, theologian or pastor is to gain a more radical insight into the minds of the writers of the New Testament. This paper seeks to achieve such insight by presenting a clearer understanding of the conceptualities behind the Corinthian correspondence than has been done in previous works. Though the discernment of such conceptuality is always a delicate task, the phenomenon of the quotation of the OT in the Corinthian letters provides a control by which to clarify the procedures of the one who quotes.

A. T. Hanson's words are directly to the point:

. . . if we are to come to any satisfactory solution of the relation of the Old Testament to the New, we cannot simply ignore or rule out of court the solution to this problem adopted by the New Testament writers themselves. In other words, it will not do simply to bypass the New Testament interpretation of Scripture as something which has no relevance for modern Christians.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology (London: SPCK, 1974), p. 226.

This study will endeavor to understand the Old Testament through the mind of one New Testament writer, the Apostle Paul, as seen in his use of explicit quotations in 1 and 2 Corinthians. It has been noted that the OT was sparingly used in 1 Cor. and therefore appears to have had little use for Paul in that letter.<sup>1</sup> However, a foundational and pervasive OT conceptuality can often be found in passages devoid of any formal OT quotation.

The Old Testament has long been seen to be vital to the New. In fact, one need not look beyond the New Testament to understand this. The NT contains over 1,000 quotations and allusions, not to mention the vast body of allusion of thought.<sup>2</sup> The LXX version of the Old Testament has also long been confirmed as the main source of New Testament quotations with the result that the New Testament would be quite a different book if only the Hebrew had been in the authors' minds.<sup>3</sup> The study of the

---

<sup>1</sup>F. W. Grosheide, Commentary On The First Epistle To The Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953), pp. 103-04.

<sup>2</sup>B. F. C. Atkinson, "The Textual Background of the Use of the Old Testament by the New," Journal of the Transactions of The Victoria Institute, LXXIX (1947), p. 39. Cf. Carl Harris Marbury, "Old Testament Textual Traditions In The New Testament: Studies in Text-Types" (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1968), p. 147.

<sup>3</sup>Henry Barclay Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1914), p. 404.

use of the Old Testament by the writers of the New Testament<sup>1</sup> will therefore bear rich dividends in many aspects of study in 1 and 2 Corinthians.

OTHER DISCIPLINES RELATIVE TO  
THE OT IN 1 AND 2 CORINTHIANS

A close study of the texts in question can make a contribution to the study of the state of the Greek Old Testament text in the first century A.D.<sup>2</sup> A comparison

---

<sup>1</sup>An early example is A. G. Tholuck, "The Citations of the Old Testament in the New," trans. Charles J. Aitken, Bibliotheca Sacra 11 (1854), pp. 569-76. A book which covers all the NT quotations in a concise manner is August Clemen's Der Gebrauch Des Alten Testaments In Den Neutestamentlichen Schriften (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1895). W. Dittmar's book, Vetus Testamentum in Novo (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1899), is an unannotated textual-comparative study of the OT in the NT. David McCalman Turpie's volume, The New Testament View of the Old (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1872), solely concerns the IF and their implied view of Scripture. See Franklin Johnson, The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old (London: Baptist Tract and Book Society, 1896), for a study which compares the quotations of the NT with those of general literature. His study is not made with critical regard to the chronology of the sources. Samuel Amsler's work, L'Ancien Testament Dans L'Eglise (Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1960), pp. 231-38, gives a full bibliography on OT in NT research from a hermeneutical perspective. D. Hans Lietzmann, An Die Galater (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1923), pp. 32-34, provides a cursory review of Paul's use of the OT in light of first century thought. D. Moody Smith, "The Use Of Old Testament In The New," in The Use Of The Old Testament In The New And Other Essays, ed. James M. Efird (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1972), pp. 25-35, gives a full synthesis and evaluation of the OT in NT studies with special emphasis on Harris, Dodd, and Lindars' works. E. Earle Ellis', Paul's Use of the Old Testament (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957), still remains foundational for such studies.

<sup>2</sup>See Kenneth John Thomas, "The Use Of The Septua-



of the exegesis of the New Testament writers with the Jewish or Hellenistic use of the Old Testament can display both the uniqueness and the communality in the respective methodologies.<sup>1</sup> Of perhaps most importance are the implications of such study for the historical development of the apostolic Church. As one examines the exegetical methods of the New Testament writers, one begins to uncover their hermeneutical presuppositions.<sup>2</sup> These pre-

---

gint In The Epistle To The Hebrews" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Manchester, 1959), p. vii, who states that his reconstructed text of the quotations of Hebrews nearly equals AB and is a witness for the primitive reading of the LXX in the first century A.D. He also asserts that AB are related to one translation from the Hebrew. This contrasts with Alexander Sperber, "New Testament And Septuagint," Journal of Biblical Literature 59 (1940), p. 278, who concludes that A is part of Origen's asterisk type and the NT quotations whereas B is a second translation reflected in the obelus type and Vetus Latina. Also, in contradiction to Sperber's thesis, we agree with Robert Horton Gundry's remark in The Use Of The Old Testament In St. Matthew's Gospel With Special Reference To The Messianic Hope (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), p. 160, n. 3, that A and B are too mixed to be used as norms for any one type of text.

<sup>1</sup>See for example, Joseph Bonsirven, Exégèse Rabbinique et Exégèse Paulinienne (Paris: Beuchesne Et Ses Fils, 1939); J. W. Doeve, Jewish Hermeneutics In The Synoptic Gospels And Acts (Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp., N.V., 1954); Krister Stendahl, The School of St. Matthew (Uppsala: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1954), p. 182, has shown that the methodology at this level can, and often does, affect the text-form of the quotation; Frederick C. Grant, Ancient Judaism and the New Testament (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1960); W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (London: S.P.C.K., 1962); and Martin McNamara, The New Testament And The Palestinian Targum To The Pentateuch (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966).

<sup>2</sup>Matthew Black, "The Christological Use Of The Old Testament In The New Testament," New Testament Studies 18 (1971-72), p. 1, notes the fresh impetus given

suppositions, because they are not merely academic sets of interpretational paradigms but vital and organic manifestations of the central life and hope of early Christianity, pierce straight to the heart of the theological foundations of the early Church. Such use of the OT cannot be simply reduced to an apologetic intention (Lindars) due to the wide range of application both to the Greeks in Acts 17, the Greeks of the third Gospel and many Hellenistic-Christians.<sup>1</sup> C. H. Dodd tried to change "the prejudice"<sup>2</sup> of treating the use of the OT by the NT as if it were no more than an ancient relic which was devoid of any relevance to modern understanding of the Gospel. R. V. G. Tasker has referred to the revived current interest in the subject of the OT in the NT as "a rediscovery of the obvious."<sup>3</sup> A recent survey in the form of a bibliographical essay relates the place of

---

to OT in NT research along hermeneutical lines by the DSS and Testimonia and "more importantly, by recognition that, hermeneutically, the New Testament belongs to the same tradition." Carmignac, "Les Citations de L'Ancien Testament dans 'La Guerre des Fils de Lumière Contre les Fils de Ténèbres,'" Revue Biblique 63 (1956), p. 239, makes a similar observation regarding implicit quotations at Qumran which provide insights into the psychology of the authors. David E. Aune, "Early Christian Biblical Interpretation," Evangelical Quarterly 41 (1969), pp. 89-96, notes the impact of the OT on Christian thought in general.

<sup>1</sup>Amsler, ATE, pp. 8-9.

<sup>2</sup>C. H. Dodd, According To The Scriptures (London: Nisbet & Co., Ltd., 1962), p. 132.

<sup>3</sup>R. V. G. Tasker, The Old Testament In The New Testament (London: S. C. M. Press Ltd., 1946), p. 10.

Targum and Midrash to the use of the OT in the NT.<sup>1</sup>

### COMPARATIVE INFERENCES

Inevitably, this study will be based in part upon comparative inferences, therefore one must beware the pitfalls of "Parallelomania."<sup>2</sup> Samuel Sandmel urges the student to guard against abstractions apart from specific and detailed study of the context as well as the comparison of excerpts; for example, one needs to be aware that Paul, Philo, Qumran, and the Rabbis should overlap due to their historical and cultural propinquity but that such overlaps may not be of any significance in and of themselves. Finally, one should realize that "Paul's context is of infinitely more significance than the question of the alleged parallels."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Merrill P. Miller, "Targum, Midrash And The Use Of The Old Testament In The New Testament," Journal For The Study Of Judaism 2 (1971), pp. 60-64. See pp. 60-64 for a developed methodology of discerning a midrashic or targumic form in the NT; esp. p. 60, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup>Samuel Sandmel, "Parallelomania," Journal of Biblical Literature 81 (1962), pp. 1-13.

<sup>3</sup>Sandmel, JBL 81:2-5. A. J. B. Higgins, The Christian Significance of the Old Testament (London: Independent Press Ltd., 1949), p. 8, also stresses the need for contextual awareness. Howell Crawford Toy, Quotations in the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884), is an example of the neglect of contextual motivation for the textual use of the OT quotations. His tendency is to note rather than try to explain various alterations. R. Le Déaut, "Traditions Targumiques Dans Le Corpus Paulinien?" Biblica 42 (1961), p. 28, notes a weakness in S-B, Davies', and Daube's works is that they utilize materials which are disparate and of uncertain date in order to shed light on the much

# THE CENTRALITY OF THE GREEK OT

It is commonly established that Paul used the Greek OT almost exclusively and it appears improbable that he altered the LXX to conform to the Hebrew.<sup>1</sup> The LXX was used whether it was accurate to the Hebrew or not.<sup>2</sup> In fact, to understand that Paul used the Greek

---

older NT texts. J. W. Doeve, Jewish Hermeneutics In The Synoptic Gospels And Acts (Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp., N.V., 1954), p. 63, n. 3, cautions that when using S-B one needs to inquire how the particular exegesis was arrived at and by what exegetical means.

<sup>1</sup>Save the Job citation(s?); F. H. Woods, "Quotations," A Dictionary Of The Bible IV, ed. James Hastings (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902), p. 187. Samuel Sandmel, "Philo's Place In Judaism: A Study Of Conceptions Of Abraham In Jewish Literature," Hebrew Union College Annual 15 (1954), p. 221, shows that Philo was also indifferent to the Hebrew OT. Stendahl, SSM, p. 195, asserts that Matthew's formula quotations show a picking and choosing among various text-types and midrash in order to establish the fulfillment motif while the remainder of his quotations is mainly the Palestinian LXX text. Gundry, MUOT, pp. 152-58; 177, has shown that, to the contrary, Markan explicit quotations stand out clearly in their conformity to the LXX while all the other groups of synoptic quotations show an overwhelmingly mixed text-form, thereby denying Stendahl's assertion of the distinctiveness of Matthew's formula citations and their ensuing separate redactional stage. No such debate centers around Paul's explicit quotations.

<sup>2</sup>B. F. C. Atkinson, "The Textual Background of the Use of the Old Testament by the New," Journal of The Transactions of the Victoria Institute LXXIX (1947), p. 41. For example, O. Michel, Paulus Und Seine Bibel (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1929), p. 68, writes regarding the omission of ruāh which would have better suited Paul's sense in the quotation of Isa. 40:13 in 1 Cor. 2:16: "Es ist selbst-verständlich, dass er imstande war, den hebraischen Urtext seiner Bibel zur lesen, aber er lebt und arbeitet nur mit seiner griechischen Bibel."

Bible is a key to the fuller understanding of his thought.<sup>1</sup> However, at this stage of LXX study no unified textual tradition can be assumed as a starting basis. This is made obvious by the variations of the LXX from the MT.<sup>2</sup>

There can also be no assumption of a unified interpretive tradition. The problem of relating Judaism to Christian writings in the Pharisaic period will be discussed below.<sup>3</sup> But there is a way toward a more accurate relation of Judaism to the NT:

What will concern the student of NT is not so much formal rabbinic hermeneutic principles as the variety of techniques used in biblical interpretation which cannot really be classified as to formal principles or which existed, at least in an incipient form, long before the descriptive technical terminology.<sup>4</sup>

The methodology, therefore, of relating any continuity of tradition from Jesus through the pre-Pauline Jewish and Hellenistic churches to Paul must be based on a detailed study of particular passages in order to test the general theses of Dodd, Harris or Lindars. Miller asserts that "this is not the time for further comprehensive treatments of the use of the OT in the NT."<sup>5</sup> Therefore, while the format of this thesis will share in characteristics as aged as Drusius,<sup>6</sup> as do nearly all those that followed

---

<sup>1</sup>Michel, P&SB, p. 57.      <sup>2</sup>Smith, UOTN, p. 8.

<sup>3</sup>Pages 12ff.      <sup>4</sup>Miller, JSJ, p. 49.

<sup>5</sup>Miller, JSJ, p. 76.

<sup>6</sup>Johannis Drusius, TA IEPA ΠΑΡΑΛΛΗΛΑ

him, it will present the data in textual and contextual specifics as well as in relation to the influences of early Jewish and Christian exegetical traditions.

#### AIMS OF THE STUDY

This study of the Corinthian quotations has two aims which relate to the intersection of the textual and conceptual vectors. The first is to examine more closely the textual background of the quotations. As Hanson writes, "to ask whether any given author 'followed the LXX' or not is an oversimplification."<sup>1</sup> The manifold evidence of Greek and Hebrew OT MSS at Qumran and the present state of Septuagintal studies justifies separate study of the text of the Corinthian quotations. The two-fold use of gathering together quotations by a certain author as outlined by E. Hatch still remains valid and is adopted in this paper:

. . . (a) it enables us to ascertain approximately the text which was in use in his time; (b) it enables

---

(Franecker: Excudebat Aegidius Radaeus, 1588).

<sup>1</sup>Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology (London: SPCK, 1974), p. 197. See the section on textual history of LXX. While Ellis' work, PUOT, is still indispensable, at the time he wrote that the textual investigation of the quotations was "well covered," p. 1. As a result he placed great emphasis on theological reasons for changes in the Greek OT text-forms in the quotations. Marbury, OTTT, p. 160, believes that this is premature to a full textual examination. The point is that the textual and interpretational elements must inform one another in drawing conclusions about either subject.



us, upon a general estimate of the mode in which he quotes Scripture, to appropriate the value of the contributions which his quotations make to textual criticism.<sup>1</sup>

The second aim of the paper is to understand why Paul selected and, in many cases, edited a particular Old Testament passage. The words of John Hurd in his stimulating work on 1 Corinthians are appropriate:

The fullest possible understanding of Paul's letters must rest in the fullest possible understanding of the factors which caused Paul to write.<sup>2</sup>

This understanding will be developed by a comparative examination of the contexts from both Testaments and first century thought in order to expose the framework of Paul's hermeneutic.

The writer's rationale for determining which quotations are to be examined is that of H. B. Swete:

. . . (1) those which are cited with an introductory formula . . . (2) those which, though not announced by a formula, appear from the context to be intended as quotations, or agree verbatim with some context in the O.T.<sup>3</sup>

The thesis adds to Swete's list of quotations for 1 and 2 Cor., however.

The format will be the same for each quotation. A Textual Display will present the texts from the MT,

---

<sup>1</sup>Edwin Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1889), p. 138.

<sup>2</sup>John Coolidge Hurd, Jr., The Origin of 1 Corinthians (London: S.P.C.K., 1965), p. xv.

<sup>3</sup>Henry Barclay Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1914), p. 382ff.

LXX and New Testament. Appropriate New Testament parallel quotations will also be displayed. The subsequent three sections will list and discuss, where needed, the variants for the MT, LXX and New Testament passages. The fifth section, headed Textual, will explore the affinities and dissimilarities of the New Testament quotation and its source with a view to identifying the text-type used by Paul. The Contextual section will describe the contexts of the Old and New Testament passages in preparation for the final Hermeneutical presentation which will investigate the possible practical or theological factors which influenced Paul in his use of the Old Testament with resultant considerations such as his fidelity to the source's context and editorial methodology. Two questions form the <sup>a</sup>per<sup>a</sup>imeters of this study. What is the precise relationship between the words, grammar and syntax of the OT text and its NT quotation form? Does the text type of the OT, as represented in 1 and 2 Corinthians, seem to have been chosen or constructed with particular and premeditated appropriateness for the Corinthian situation? If so, what methodological considerations affected the choice or construction?



## TEXTUAL VECTORS

### ORAL AND WRITTEN TRADITION IN FIRST CENTURY PALESTINE

#### Memory And Tradition

The transmissional mode of the earliest Christian tradition has important implications for the various quotation forms in which that tradition now appears in 1 and 2 Cor. While mode of transmission has more direct and appreciable bearing on Gospel research it needs to be applied also to the portions of Paul's writing where a formative history seems to underlie his use of the OT.

Birger Gerhardsson. A nucleus around which much of the current debate has evolved is a work by Birger Gerhardsson.<sup>1</sup> Harald Riesenfeld, Gerhardsson's mentor,

---

<sup>1</sup>Birger Gerhardsson, Memory And Manuscript, trans. Eric J. Sharpe (Uppsala: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1961), has since published a reply to the criticism of his position. The reply, Tradition And Transmission In Early Christianity, trans. Eric J. Sharpe (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1964), is centered on answering three questions: How much did first century A.D. Pharisaism apply Rabbinic principles? How widespread were these principles in the first century A.D. in all groups outside of Pharisaism? To what extent did Jesus and the Church follow these principles or create new forms? T&T has been reviewed by the following, among others: R. S. Barbour, Scottish Journal of Theology 19 (1966), pp. 114-15; Lou H. Silberman, Journal of Biblical Literature 84 (1965), pp. 459-60; and C. K. Barrett, Journal of Theological

first announced this thesis at the Oxford conference on the Gospels in 1957.<sup>1</sup> Gerhardsson's Memory And Manuscript, published in 1961, more fully developed Riesenfeld's thesis by proposing that the memory techniques apparent in Rabbinical literature were current in the early first century and that Paul himself had probably mastered them. Midrashic exegesis<sup>2</sup> existed centuries before the Tannaitic period.<sup>3</sup> Gerhardsson notes that the Rabbis memorized all of the Torah<sup>4</sup> and that Jewish boys were early trained in the law and then the traditions.<sup>5</sup> While not giving a starting period for mishnaic work he notes that while mishnaic and midrashic forms stood side by side in the early centuries A.D., the mishnaic became predominant later.<sup>6</sup> The process by which the MT was preserved on the one hand and fluid interpretation flourished on the other is explained:

---

Studies NS 16 (1965), pp. 488-89. Barrett, JTS, p. 89, feels that Gerhardsson has not added materially to his MM arguments. For a favorable review see C. H. Pinnock, Christianity Today vol. 9, no. 25 (Sept. 24, 1965), pp. 28-29.

<sup>1</sup>Harald Riesenfeld, The Gospel Tradition And Its Beginnings (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Limited, 1957).

<sup>2</sup>Or, as Addison G. Wright, "The Literary Genre Midrash," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 28 (1966), p. 135, would assert, midrashic form, rather than exegesis.

<sup>3</sup>Gerhardsson, MM, pp. 35-36.

<sup>4</sup>Gerhardsson, MM, p. 40.

<sup>5</sup>Gerhardsson, MM, p. 89f.

<sup>6</sup>Gerhardsson, MM, p. 90.

These two tendencies are also psychologically associated: the perception of the text as sacred leads partly to a desire to preserve the text without corruption, and partly to a desire to appropriate all its incomparable riches. Furthermore, certainty that the sacred words of the text have in fact been preserved without distortion adds to the frankness with which the very letter of the text is drawn upon for teaching purposes.<sup>1</sup>

It seems to be just this fact of fluidity that makes many of Gerhardsson's conclusions open to question. While interpretation was fluid were the methods of exegesis firm? Or, with the formation of the final redactions of the Rabbis, were other forms and methods excluded?

To present Gerhardsson's thesis at its simplest, the early Christian tradition was transmitted both orally and systematically in accord with strict principles of memorization. The obvious implication of this is that a reliable pattern can be traced back from the tradition in its present to its earliest forms. To state this thesis at its extreme, the present form is the earliest form with only the minimum of editorial alteration.

In his discussion of the schools of oral torah Gerhardsson writes that "we do not know how schools of the bet hammidrash type were organized during the century before Jabneh."<sup>2</sup> He follows this statement with a discussion of the schools in Tannaitic and Amoraic times.

---

<sup>1</sup>Gerhardsson, MM, pp. 40-41.

<sup>2</sup>Gerhardsson, MM, p. 90.

The rule regarding oral law, a cornerstone in Gerhardsson's argument, is not found explicitly until b. Git. 60b (b. Tem. 14b) but "the practice seems however to be established before the beginning of the Christian era."<sup>1</sup> Also the rabbinic distinction between the two torahs is precisely drawn at the point at which Gerhardsson has the most interest; ". . . that of how the material is transmitted and studied, and how it is used in official contexts."<sup>2</sup>

Criticisms. With reference to these problems in Gerhardsson's thesis Morton Smith writes that "to read back into the period before 70 the developed rabbinic technique of +200 is a gross anachronism."<sup>3</sup> Concentrating on the Gospels Smith notes: 1) there is no system apparent in the Gospel parallels equal to rabbinic principles; 2) the Gospels are narrative while rabbinics are expository; 3) the Gospels offer fantastic tales of Christ while rabbinics do not go to the same extremes regarding the Rabbis; 4) the Gospel arrangement is neither mishnaic nor midrashic; 5) the NT as a whole shows no traces of mnemonic and teaching methods of rabbinical literature.<sup>4</sup> While several of these points

---

<sup>1</sup>Gerhardsson, MM, p. 159. <sup>2</sup>Gerhardsson, MM, p. 27.

<sup>3</sup>Morton Smith, "A Comparison Of Early Christian And Early Rabbinic Tradition," Journal of Biblical Literature 82 (1963), p. 169.

<sup>4</sup>Smith, JBL:173-74. Smith's fifth point may be overemphatic in its exclusiveness.

could be contested they point up the essential non-rabbinic character of the Gospels.

Martin McNamara adds another problem to the attempt to place rabbinical methods in the first century:

Another difficulty with rabbinic material is that it is linked with the Jewish schools; it need not necessarily have been known to the masses of the Jewish people, or if it was, this was probably from sources other than the scholastic discussions in which we now find it.<sup>1</sup>

This complex problem has been given a major advance by the work of Neusner in his three volume work on pre-A.D. 70 traditions.<sup>2</sup> He argues that the memorized oral modes of transmission of rabbinics are anachronistic and did not begin until after the A.D. 70 cataclysm.<sup>3</sup> Comparison may therefore profitably be made between the textual and literary affinities of Paul and the Rabbis but their specific historical relationship must be based on demonstrable critical study.

One apparent fact is that all evidence which supports the oral transmission is based on literary data.<sup>4</sup> Gerhardsson is also aware of this fact though he

---

<sup>1</sup>Martin McNamara, Targum And Testament (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1968), p. 11.

<sup>2</sup>Jacob Neusner, The Rabbinic Traditions About The Pharisees Before 70, 3 vols. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971).

<sup>3</sup>Neusner, RT, III, p. 174ff.

<sup>4</sup>Neusner, Early Rabbinic Judaism (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), p. 76, writes, "That these data indicate a

writes that "too much scepticism in face of this information is unwarranted."<sup>1</sup> However, one must construct one's thesis on the available evidence whether or not it is sceptical. With reference to, and in agreement with, Morton Smith's statement of "gross anachronism,"<sup>2</sup> Neusner asserts that adequate evidence does not exist to clearly illuminate the transmissional methods of pre-70 Judaism or Christianity.<sup>3</sup> In view of the fact that there were scribes (writers) in Jesus' time and that the pre-70 Qumran materials were written the necessity of pre-70 oral composition becomes highly questionable.<sup>4</sup>

---

background of oral transmission is a conclusion reached by many, but it is not a fact implied by the tradition." Bernard J. Bamberger, "The Dating of Aggadic Materials," Journal of Biblical Literature 68 (1949), p. 115, criticizes Wolfson in his work on Philo for a similar tendency to selectively use late sources.

<sup>1</sup>Gerhardsson, MM, p. 86.

<sup>2</sup>Morton Smith, "A Comparison Of Early Christian And Early Rabbinic Tradition," Journal of Biblical Literature 82 (1963), p. 169, writes this regarding Gerhardsson's method of reading Rabbinic methods back into the first century.

<sup>3</sup>Neusner, ERJ, p. 78. See his The Rabbinic Traditions About The Pharisees Before 70, Vol. 1, pp. 6-9, for a caution regarding methods of uncritically using Rabbinic materials apart from their sources. In a critical response to an article by J. M. Baumgartner, "The Unwritten Law In The Pre-Rabbinic Period," Journal For The Study Of Judaism 3 (1972), pp. 7-29, Jacob Neusner, "The Written Tradition In The Pre-Rabbinic Period," Journal For The Study Of Judaism 4 (1973), pp. 57ff, suggests that there were written sources of pre-70 A.D. date. This is based in part on the fact that there is no adequate evidence for pre-70 A.D. methodology and on the lack of mnemonics in the sources.

<sup>4</sup>See Neusner, ERJ, p. 80. Lou H. Silberman,



Regarding Gerhardsson's theoretical prohibition of the writing down of tradition, Strack finds that on the basis of his data "there is nothing to point to an interdict on the writing down of Halakoth, and still less on the writing of haggadic matter, formally promulgated and universally recognized."<sup>1</sup> It was not writing in and of itself that was banned but rather writing that was intended for public use.<sup>2</sup> Also Aquila probably fully developed the memory forms because it is in his time that the Tanna or reciters are first referred to.<sup>3</sup>

The assumed continuity between Yavnean and earlier "pedagogical" methods has no hard evidence to support it. This is evident from the fact that the Pharisaic tradition almost completely ignores the entire

---

"Review of Gerhardsson's Tradition And Transmission In Early Christianity," Journal of Biblical Literature 84 (1965), p. 459, writes that "even within the Pharisaic-rabbinic literature, the assumption of one exclusive procedure can hardly be sustained." Roger Le Déaut, "The Current State Of Targumic Studies," Biblical Theology Bulletin 4 (1974), p. 5, cites 11 QTg Job; 4QTg Lev; 4 QTg Job as proof that written targums in Aramaic existed at an early date.

<sup>1</sup>Hermann Strack, Introduction To The Talmud And Midrash, trans. not named (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society Of America, 1931), p. 17.

<sup>2</sup>Strack, ITM, p. 17. Gerhardsson, MM, p. 29, allows for written notes in Oral Torah but only for private scholastic use. On pp. 160-61 of MM, reminder books are discussed. Their usage seems to be more prevalent in Palestine than in Babylon so Gerhardsson concludes that the "opposition to the act of writing seems to have been weaker in the Palestinian colleges than in the Babylonian," p. 161.

<sup>3</sup>Neusner, ERJ, p. 86.

gamut of types and forms of the shaping of biblical literature. Neusner concludes regarding this fact:

That again points to the opposite conclusion, namely, that the Pharisees of the rabbinic tradition were innovators who paid no attention to the forms of biblical literature.<sup>1</sup>

The apparent literary forms and the easily memorized and balanced sections of early Rabbinic Judaism point toward a late first century date. Another fact supportive to written transmission is that popular sermons during the Amoraic period have survived even though they sometimes contradict the teachings of the patriarchs and schools. How were these sermons preserved? Silberman wonders if a technique different than that operative in the school's was used.<sup>2</sup> He suggests that much more groundwork needs to be laid before debate can continue regarding the methods of transmission in the first century A.D.

#### Memory And Quotation

More to the point of this study is the implication of Gerhardsson's thesis for Pauline methodology. Did Paul, like the Rabbis of a later day, have the Torah memorized or were his methods less dependent on a phenomenal memory than on written sources? Of course much of this must remain a moot point because one simply does not

---

<sup>1</sup>Neusner, ERJ, p. 83.

<sup>2</sup>Silberman, JBL, 84:460.



have the data available to settle the matter conclusively but the current opposition to Gerhardsson's thesis makes the use of an encyclopedic memory less tenable concerning Paul's OT usage.

If Paul's full training in the rigors of the Pharisees<sup>1</sup> was based on a meticulous memory this would certainly affect one's conclusions regarding the verbal or syntactical nature of his quotations. If not, then the suggestion of "memory lapse" becomes more probable and the entire question of the nature of textual reflections in his quotations is affected.

A memory slip may often be posited simply as a "facile solution" or "gross oversimplification" of the problems involved.<sup>2</sup> However, one should not exclude the possibility completely.<sup>3</sup> Facility in memory would be a necessity due to the bulk of the Scripture MSS and the expense of having them always at hand. The conclusion that a quotation has taken on its present form by way of a memory slip can be denied if one can show that the change is an intentional interpretational adaptation.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Gal. 1:14; Phil. 3:5-6.

<sup>2</sup>Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Essays On The Semitic Background Of The New Testament (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971), pp. 60-61.

<sup>3</sup>Donald Alfred Hagner, The Use Of The Old And New Testaments In Clement Of Rome (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973), pp. 103-04.

<sup>4</sup>Thomas, LXXH, pp. 14-16. George Milligan, Here And There Among The Papyri (London: Hodder and Stoughton

Jindřich Mánek,<sup>1</sup> building on the thesis that two or more witnesses were needed to establish a NT point of doctrine (Dt. 19:15), writes that if composite quotations were included by memory and mistakenly ascribed to only one author they would then lose their purpose as a double-witness.

### Summary

Thus it would seem appropriate that there is no a priori reason for deciding against the use of written notes in the early Christian communities.<sup>2</sup> Key concepts could become formalized and written at a very early stage to be passed on in both oral and written forms as the occasion allowed. The form of the OT quotation in such a tradition would depend on factors quite removed from the situation of Paul when he incorporated it into his letters. Both hermeneutical and textual factors could have influenced a text as will be seen in the following

---

Limited, 1922), p. 49, writes: "The marvel, indeed, is not the changes which were introduced into the quotations, but the general accuracy with which they were reproduced."

<sup>1</sup>Jindřich Mánek, "Composite Quotations In The New Testament And Their Purpose," Communio Viatorum 13 (1970), p. 187.

<sup>2</sup>Gundry, MUOT, p. 182, has asserted that Matthew was a note-taker and that shorthand was used in Jesus' time. See also Edgar J. Goodspeed, Matthew Apostle And Evangelist (Philadelphia: The John C. Winston Company, 1959), p. 111, where he asks, "The secretaries of the prophets! Had Jesus one?," and answers in the affirmative, identifying Matthew. See esp. p. 75 for the reference to shorthand in the Oxyrhynchus papyri.

section on Conceptual Vectors.

LXX TRANSMISSION-HISTORY  
IN FIRST CENTURY PALESTINE

Recent Methodology

Translations, Targums and Recensions. With the rise of interest in targumic influences on the NT came the need to use proper methodology in ascribing a text-form of an OT quote to such influence. Paul Kahle's theory of Greek Targums makes this even more necessary.<sup>1</sup> Sidney Jellicoe provisionally rejects this theory due to its reliance on a late date for Aristeas and an unknown "Biblical commission" which formed a revised official text.<sup>2</sup> Stendahl rejects the theory of an abundance of Greek targums due to lack of textual evidence of pre-A.D. 100 targums and the lack of LXX variants in the synoptic Tradition.<sup>3</sup> Smith notes that Qumran evidences of Greek fragments suggest a standardized text-form in the pre-Christian period. He also sees no evidence for a process of standardization and refers to the prologue to Wisdom

---

<sup>1</sup>Paul E. Kahle, The Cairo Geniza, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959), pp. 125; 135.

<sup>2</sup>Sidney Jellicoe, The Septuagint And Modern Study (Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1968), p. 60.

<sup>3</sup>Krister Stendahl, The School of St. Matthew (Uppsala: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1954), p. 180. He prefers to see the NT reading as a possible witness to a Palestinian LXX.

of Sirach in the second century B.C. which speaks of a three-fold canon in a way more than of a loose and unofficial collection of Greek OT targums.<sup>1</sup> He, like Stendahl, allows the possibility that other translations existed:

Accordingly variations in New Testament quotations from the principal Septuagint manuscripts may in any instance simply indicate reliance upon a variant Greek translation.<sup>2</sup>

This concept of co-existent translations or recensions seems to fit the evidence at hand. The discernment of the characteristics and extent of these translations and recensions forms the growing edge of current research.

Dead Sea Contributions. A frequent misconception concerning LXX text-forms has been that of an underlying standard MT Vorlage.<sup>3</sup> The discoveries near the Dead Sea, 4Q especially, reveal that several Hebrew and Greek textual traditions were present in first-century Palestine. The 4Q MSS show a spread of three hundred years<sup>4</sup> but do not display one standard and pervasive text-

---

<sup>1</sup>Smith, UOTN, p. 10.      <sup>2</sup>Smith, UOTN, p. 11.

<sup>3</sup>Marbury, OTTT, p. 164. Daniel J. Harrington, "The Biblical Text Of Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 33, p. 1, notes that the assumption of one Hebrew text was behind earlier work on LAB and that the DSS now make a reconsideration of the evidence necessary. This conception is present in Stendahl's The School Of St. Matthew, *passim*.

<sup>4</sup>Chronicles, 4th cen. B.C.; 4Q Sam<sup>b</sup>, 3rd cen. B.C.; 4Q Sam<sup>c</sup>, early 1st cen. B.C.; 4Q Sam<sup>a</sup>, late 1st cen. B.C. See Frank Moore Cross, "The Contribution Of The Qumran Discoveries To The Study Of The Biblical Text," in Qumran And The History Of The Biblical Text (Cambridge: Harvard

type to which Qumran was committed or which was propagated in the scriptorium.<sup>1</sup> Though the work of Thackeray, Barthélemy, Cross and others is, at times contradictory, one must now cope with the agreed possibility of a Greek version based on a Hebrew text which differs from the MT.<sup>2</sup> D. W. Gooding has shown that, though the heavy midrashic elements in 3 Reigns 2 imply that the revisers knew the difference between the Bible and their commentary, the apparent revision to a Hebrew basis shows where the authority lay for those early Jews.<sup>3</sup> Thus, the reason for the non-MT readings implied in the Greek versions may<sup>4</sup> relate to a change in the Hebrew text. In other words, a Greek version may witness

---

University Press, 1975), pp. 285f., reprint from Israel Exploration Journal 16 (1966), pp. 81-95.

<sup>1</sup>Patrick W. Skehan, "The Qumran Manuscripts And Textual Criticism," VT Congress Volume (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957), p. 149. See also Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Old Testament Text," in The Cambridge History Of The Bible I (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1970), P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans, eds., p. 185 and his more detailed exposition in Textus IV (1964), pp. 95-132, "Aspects Of The Textual Transmission Of The Bible In The Light Of Qumran Manuscripts."

<sup>2</sup>George Wesley Buchanan, To The Hebrews (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1972), p. xxviii, applies this insight to the quotations of Hebrews.

<sup>3</sup>D. W. Gooding, Relics Of Ancient Exegesis (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), pp. 115-16.

<sup>4</sup>Another option could be that one is faced with a different translation of the same Hebrew word. See the cautions regarding retroversion by M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Theory And Practice Of Textual Criticism: The Text-Critical Use Of The Septuagint," Textus III (1963), pp. 130-158.

to a non-MT Hebrew Vorlage.

### Description Of The Methodology

Theodotion. The affinities of some of the NT quotations with a Theodotionic text type are well known. Barthélemy places the activity of Theodotion in Palestine and suggests that there may have been several editions, possibly produced by means of a school or by his predecessors.<sup>1</sup> It appears, however, that this text, rather than being the first and final translation, has a history of its own. Frederic Kenyon notes that Theodotion was possibly based on an earlier version because the NT and early Fathers often agree with it.<sup>2</sup> James Montgomery<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Dominique Barthélemy, Les Devanciers D'Aquila (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), pp. 157; 246. See p. 149 for the three Talmudic traditions supporting the thesis that Theodotion was Jonathan ben 'Uzziel; also Kahle, CG<sup>2</sup>, p. 196, for the opposing view. Alexander Sperber, The Bible In Aramaic IVB (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973), p. 3, calls the discussion of who Onkelos and Jonathan were and where they lived a "hopeless question." With reference to the date of Theodotion, Barthélemy places him c. 30-50 A.D. but the 4Q LXX Num. fragments are dated around the turn of the era and show Theodotion-type revisions; Patrick W. Skehan, "The Biblical Scrolls From Qumran And The Text Of The Old Testament," Biblical Archaeologist 28 (1965), p. 94.

<sup>2</sup>Frederic G. Kenyon, Recent Developments In The Textual Criticism Of The Greek Bible (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), p. 103.

<sup>3</sup>James A. Montgomery, A Critical And Exegetical Commentary On The Book Of Daniel (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927), p. 50.



speaks of pre-Theodotion as a body of received pre-Christian tradition which was not necessarily written. This ur-Theodotion was used in the LXX to bridge the lacunae and correct false readings in Daniel. Montgomery links this tradition with the second century Theodotion and calls him the "hellenistic Onkelos, whose work was facilitated by the presence of a large amount of customary oral translation of the Scriptures, possessed by him memoriter."<sup>1</sup>

Though Matthew, in his formula citations, is not directly dependent on the LXX nor on Theodotion "he often follows an exegetical or translational tradition alien sometimes to the one and sometimes to the other."<sup>2</sup>

Sherman Johnson identifies the Theodotionic tradition with Montgomery's Hellenistic oral targum. Sidney Jellicoe places ur-Theodotion early in the first century A.D.<sup>3</sup> He reconstructs the growth of ur-Theodotion in the following manner. It was the work of Greek Jews of Western Asia Minor who used their own translation to fill up the gaps in the LXX books. When Anthony gave Cleopatra the Pergamene library, the bible of ur-Theodotion probably went with the 200,000 MSS to

---

<sup>1</sup>Montgomery, Dan., p. 50.

<sup>2</sup>Sherman Johnson, "The Biblical Quotations In Matthew," Harvard Theological Review 36 (1943), p. 140.

<sup>3</sup>Sidney Jellicoe, The Septuagint And Modern Study (Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1968), p. 83.

Alexandria. There this text was used by the Jews to complete Reigns.<sup>1</sup> But recently the work on the early strata of the Greek OT has become more specifically related to Reigns and to the minor prophets.

The Book of Reigns. Henry St. John Thackeray<sup>2</sup> initially found that two translators were present in 1-4 Reigns. Barthélemy<sup>3</sup> concluded that one was indeed a translator but that the other was a revisor of the first according to a proto-MT basis.<sup>4</sup> The revision level, now commonly known as καίγε<sup>5</sup> or proto-Theodotion, is provisionally found in Lam.<sup>LXX</sup> and possibly Ruth, 2 Sam. 10:1-24:5 (βγ), 1 Kgs. 22 and all of 2 Kgs. in the "LXX" column of Origen (γδ) and others. Barthélemy writes:

L'existence de cette première recension juive nous oblige donc à envisager l'oeuvre d'Aquila sous un jour un peu différent: il s'agit d'une sur-

---

<sup>1</sup>Jellicoe, SMS, pp. 89-91. See also his "Some Reflections On The KAIΓE Recension," Vetus Testamentum 23 (1973), p. 24.

<sup>2</sup>H. St. John Thackeray, The Septuagint and Jewish Worship (London: Oxford University Press, 1921).

<sup>3</sup>Barthélemy, DA, pp. 33-47; 91-143.

<sup>4</sup>However, see T. Muraoka, "The Greek Texts Of Samuel-Kings: Incomplete Translations Or Recensional Activity?," IOSCS Proceedings, ed. Robert A. Kraft (1972), pp. 90-107, for a recent support of Thackeray's original position that βδ is indeed a second translator.

<sup>5</sup>See Marbury, OTTT; Jellicoe, VT 23:15-24; and esp. Emanuel Tov, "The State Of The Question: Problems And Proposed Solutions," IOSCS Proceedings, ed. Robert A. Kraft (1972), pp. 3-12, for a recent developmental survey of LXX transmission-history.



recension et non d'une traduction originale.<sup>1</sup>

F. M. Cross asserts that LXX Daniel also belongs to this recension. This brings a qualified victory to the school of Lagarde regarding LXX origins.<sup>2</sup>

The Local Text Theory. F. M. Cross has expounded a local text theory which assigns a Hebrew Vorlage and its corresponding Greek translation to each of three locations: Egypt, Palestine, Babylon.<sup>3</sup> According to Cross, somewhere in the second or first century B.C. the Egyptian OG was conformed to the Palestinian Hebrew text

---

<sup>1</sup>D. Barthélemy, "Redécouverte D'Un Chaînon Manquant De L'Histoire De La Septante," Revue Biblique 60 (1953), p. 25.

<sup>2</sup>Frank Moore Cross, Jr., "The History Of The Biblical Text In The Light Of Discoveries In The Judaean Desert," Harvard Theological Review 57 (1964), p. 283. See also Harry M. Orlinsky, "Qumran And The Present State Of Old Testament Studies: The Septuagint Text," Journal of Biblical Literature 78 (1959), and Harry M. Orlinsky, "The Septuagint--Its Use In Textual Criticism," Biblical Archaeologist 9 (1946), pp. 24-26, for a methodological view of the Archetypal theory. Kahle's pupil, Alexander Sperber, "New Testament And Septuagint," Journal of Biblical Literature 59 (1940), pp. 193-299, supports the views of Kahle. See also Sperber, "The Problems Of The Septuagint Recensions," Journal of Biblical Literature 54 (1935), pp. 73-75, for his arguments regarding the impossibility of restoring the Lucian, Hesychian and Origenic recensions to get to the original LXX.

<sup>3</sup>Frank Moore Cross, "The Evolution Of A Theory Of Local Texts," IOSCS Proceedings, ed. Robert A. Kraft (1972), pp. 108-126; HTR 57:281-99; "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related To The Original Hebrew Underlying The Septuagint," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 132 (1953), pp. 15-26. James Donald Shenkel, Chronology And Recensional Development In The Greek Text Of Kings (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), pp. 1-21, follows Cross in this three-fold Hebrew text Vorlage.

(forming proto-Lucian).<sup>1</sup> The resultant text is asserted to contain the proto-Lucianic readings found especially in  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$ , Josephus and the sixth column of Origen's hexapla. This text was in turn revised at the turn of the era according to a proto-MT text probably brought from Babylon (forming proto-Theodotion). The third stage was in the second century A.D. when Symmachus and Aquila revised  $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon$  into conformity with the official Rabbinic text of Samuel.<sup>2</sup>

Barthélemy and others, however, argue that Cross should give up the idea of the Egyptian Hebrew text due to a lack of solid support for it<sup>3</sup> and should begin with the Palestinian Hebrew text evidenced at Qumran. This text would then form the Vorlage of the Old Greek (OG)

---

<sup>1</sup>According to Cross this Palestinian Hebrew text is best seen in 4Q Sam.<sup>a b</sup>. Stendahl, SSM, p. 180 notes that AQ<sup>f</sup> manifest the Palestinian Greek recension which excludes any "wild abundance of Greek Targums." Cross, HTR 57:292, notes that the Proto-Lucian revision of the LXX of Samuel was still used by Josephus in his Antiquities c. A.D. 93-94. This Proto-Lucianic recension is seen in LAB as well. Harrington, CBQ 33:6-17, reaches the same conclusions as Cross regarding the Palestinian Hebrew Vorlage and its presence in Josephus. He dates LAB at A.D. 100 at the latest due to the ascendancy of the MT after that date. LAB's lack of reference to the fall of the temple may also indicate a pre-A.D. 70 date.

<sup>2</sup>See Barthélemy, DA, p. 208 and Cross, HTR 57: 295-96.

<sup>3</sup>Dominique Barthélemy, "A Reexamination Of The Textual Problems In 2 Sam. 11:2- 1 Kings 2:11 In The Light Of Certain Criticisms Of Les Devanciers D'Aquila," IOSCS Proceedings, ed. Robert A. Kraft (1972), p. 61. Talmon, CHB 1:197-98, also provisionally rejects the local text concept.

which immediately began to undergo a proto-Lucianic type of revision. This is the position adopted in this paper. However, the present state of research does not allow final confirmation of the Greek OT basis of the proto-Theodotionic revision:

Symmetry would suggest that the kaige recension was made from the proto-Lucian recension rather than directly from the Old Greek, but we have no basis upon which to establish its precise textual base, again owing to methodological restrictions.<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, according to Cross, proto-Lucianic readings would theoretically show that aspect of the Greek OT which cannot be placed with the OG of Egypt (or Palestine: Barthélemy) in the third century B.C. but yet is different from the καίγε text. Barthélemy does not believe that there is a proto-Lucianic text but says that it is simply the OG.<sup>2</sup> Cross identified the nature of the Lucianic text of Samuel in Greek and found that it showed

---

<sup>1</sup>Cross, IOSCS:117.

<sup>2</sup>He also denies the effects of an historical Lucian in the "Lucianic" recension, IOSCS:71ff. See Barthélemy, DA, p. 127. Sebastian P. Brock, "Lucian Redivivus. Some Reflections On Barthelémy's Les Devanciers D'Aquila," Studia Evangelica V (1969), p. 180, writes that the recensional activity which overarches α and βγ is not seen in full form in the pre-Lucian Antiochene fathers whereas post-Lucian writers show Lucianic readings. Therefore "Lucianic" should be kept as a name for such readings. Brock notes two currents, p. 181, in βγ; one which came closer to the Hebrew and another which made for better Greek. He has also shown this to be the case by examples from α (1 Sam.) where both α and βγ are partly influenced by the same Atticising tendency. See Brock, T&U, p. 177, where he maintains that βγ (2 Sam. 11:2- 1 Kings 2:11) has undergone considerable hexaplaric influence.

signs of reworking a still older text in order to conform it to a Palestinian Hebrew text of Samuel.<sup>1</sup> One needs, therefore, to be aware of and distinguish between the two identities given by Cross (a revised OG; proto-Lucianic) and Barthélemy (the OG).

### Deliniation Of Old Greek Strata

It is just such a deliniation that is at the growing edge of current research.<sup>2</sup> In this study the following methodological considerations will be applied. OG or Ant(iochian) readings (or, for Cross, Proto-Lucian) can, at this time, only be conclusively discern<sup>ed</sup> in the former prophets. The basic cursory formula used by Cross is that Lucian readings will not equal B, MT. Where Lucian = MT but  $\neq$  B the reading may then be hexaplaric.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Cross, HTR 57, *passim*; also Marbury, OTTT, pp. 10-11. However, the 4Q MSS have yet to be published in full.

<sup>2</sup>Bruce M. Metzger, Chapters In The History Of New Testament Textual Criticism (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), pp. 31ff, stressed the importance of what he termed Ur-Lucian. See also Bruce M. Metzger, "Lucian And The Lucianic Recension Of The Greek Bible," New Testament Studies 8 (1961-62). This is definitely not a new insight, however. See W. Stark, "Die Alttestamentlichen Citate Bei Den Schriftstellern Des Neuen Testaments," Zeitschrift Für Wissenschaftliche Theologie 35:464-85; 36:70-98 (1892), who demonstrated a Lucianic stratum in the quotations from the four gospels. D. W. Gooding, Recensions Of The Septuagint Pentateuch (London: The Tyndale Press, 1954), pp. 11-12, discovers a pre-Hexaplaric tradition of additions which conformed the Greek to the Hebrew in the Pentateuch. He drew no specific conclusions from this tradition at that time but did mention the early studies of Barthélemy and others.

<sup>3</sup>Cross, IOSCS:116. Sebastian Brock, personal let-

However, conformity to the MT also arises in the  $\kappa\alpha\iota\gamma\epsilon$  and hexaplaric revisions which further complicates the process.

For the establishment of OG readings one needs to single out  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  or a section of text showing a relationship to Chry, Thdt, the margin of z or the Syriac of Jacob. If such MSS are merely part of a fairly large group of MSS which usually follow B they cannot claim to represent the Ant. tradition. The MSS of B-M (except  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$ ) can more or less represent the KR with B y a being the better witnesses.<sup>1</sup>

Cross theorizes that  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  has two layers:

1) a proto-Lucian revision to the Palestinian Hebrew, and  
2) the revisions of the historical Lucian. Emanuel Tov has recently questioned the revisional character of proto-Lucian and concludes that it is rather an OG text or the OG and not a revision.<sup>2</sup> Tov is impressed by the vast geographical spread and the long chronological extent of proto-Lucian in the MSS.<sup>3</sup> He asks<sup>4</sup> if all these MSS could have been retouched by Lucianic revisors and concludes

---

ter, April 6, 1977, notes that these formulae, while being generally helpful, do not do justice to the complexity of the situation.

<sup>1</sup>Barthélemy, IOSCS:45.

<sup>2</sup>Emanuel Tov, "Lucian And Proto-Lucian," Revue Biblique 79 (1972), pp. 101-02.

<sup>3</sup>Tov, RB 79:103-04.

<sup>4</sup>Tov, RB 79:105.

they were not. If the proto-Lucianic revision generally left the OG unrevised, as Cross asserts, would it not be better to say with Tov that the sub-stratum of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2 = \text{OG}$ ? With reference to Origen's 6th column (in  $\beta\gamma$ ) Cross says it is proto-Lucianic, Barthélemy says it is OG and Tov reasons that it is more likely that Origen put the OG there rather than an obscure proto-Lucianic revision.<sup>1</sup> Tov suggests that one use the Old Latin to find early strata of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  and that quantitative revisions of Lucian to the MT may be either Lucian himself or the "Three."<sup>2</sup> Therefore, if  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  is in fact OG it may not be the Vorlage of  $\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\epsilon$ . One may need to posit  $\text{OG}^1$  and  $\text{OG}^2$ .<sup>3</sup> Tov<sup>4</sup> found that in the KR sections of Reigns in the non-Lucianic MSS the  $\text{OG} = \text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  whereas in non KR sections all non-Lucianic MSS = OG. Where  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2 \neq$  other LXX MSS in non- $\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\epsilon$  sections, Tov concludes that the other LXX MSS have been retouched and  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2 = \text{OG}$  or that two OG texts are reflected.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Tov, RB 79:105.

<sup>2</sup>Tov, RB 79:107.

<sup>3</sup>Tov, RB 79:109, n. 72. Brock, personal letter, April 6, 1977, says there are probably more than Tov allows for.

<sup>4</sup>Tov, RB 79:107.

<sup>5</sup>Tov, RB 79:109. When comparing the Greek and Masoretic texts, material found in Q may be a control which enables one to discern the presence of a possible underlying Hebrew text rather than the result of a theological motivated edition by Paul. This is because Q is relatively free from hexaplaric revisions, and therefore, of purer OG representation. With regard to the Pentateuch, with the exception of Genesis, the books appear to



### Deliniation Of Καίγε

The KR has been described by Barthélemy<sup>1</sup> and Shenkel.<sup>2</sup> Shenkel argues that KR begins in 2 Sam. 10:1 rather than 11:2 à la Thackeray and Barthélemy. Barthélemy writes that AMNcgjx<sub>2</sub>b<sub>2</sub> are usually Palestinian (KR) and never contain typical Antiochian readings (MSS boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub> in βγ and γδ) in 2 Sam. 12:1-10.<sup>3</sup> He also notes the tendency of Pal. to render -7 by the dative.<sup>4</sup> In α-βγ Ba<sub>2</sub> are the best Pal. witnesses.<sup>5</sup>

---

have circulated in varying recensional backgrounds. Patrick W. Skehan, "The Qumran Manuscripts And Textual Criticism," Vetus Testamentum Congress Volume (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957), p. 149, shows 4Q Num.<sup>a</sup> to be a mixed text while 4Q Ex.<sup>a</sup> is of LXX type. He also writes, "Greek Versions Of The Old Testament," The Jerome Biblical Commentary II (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968), p. 569, that the differences between LXX<sup>Pent</sup> and the Hebrew are "comparatively limited" when contrasted with the LXX for other books. The MSS for Gen. show a high degree of uniformity while Ex-Dt show greater variations, esp. Ex. 35-40. Frank Moore Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., 1958), pp. 143-44, also notes the scarce data for the Pentateuchal recensions. In an earlier paper, D. W. Gooding, RLXX<sup>Pent</sup>:6ff, pointed out the difficulties of isolating the pentateuchal recensions. He noted the scarcity of Lucianic readings in Gen. 14. Gooding also notes the relative purity of A from Hexaplaric asterisk readings, pp. 11-12.

<sup>1</sup>Barthélemy, DA, pp. 47-80.

<sup>2</sup>Shenkel, CRDK, pp. 113-16. With reference to 1 Cor. 1:19, it may be noted that σσφ- is a KR characteristic rendering of םספ, p. 114.

<sup>3</sup>Barthélemy, IOSCS, p. 35.

<sup>4</sup>Barthélemy, IOSCS, p. 35.

<sup>5</sup>Barthélemy, IOSCS, p. 41.

The use of a first century control is of utmost importance and the finds near the Dead Sea [4Q (yet to be fully published) and Nahal Hever] have been of great assistance in this area. However, one of the frustrations of the quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. is that, at present, virtually none of the OT passages are represented among the published fragments.<sup>1</sup> In the absence of a certain first century control, two aspects will be evaluated in the examination of Paul's OT text-forms. First, what part has Paul's hermeneutic played in shaping the text-form? Once determined, the original form may be ascertained by textual retroversion. Second, given later LXX Greek MS evidence for the Pauline reading, does such evidence indicate a harmonization to the text of Paul?

One serious problem with attempting to align the quotations of 1 and 2 Cor. with a particular text type is that nearly all the quotations are taken from OT books where the recensional and revisional strata are not yet clearly drawn. Hence one must beware the subjective element which may enter as well as the danger of drawing generalities from one limited set of texts and applying

---

<sup>1</sup>It is noteworthy that Marbury, OTTT, does not include a single quotation from 1 or 2 Cor. although half of his thesis is given over to such OT quotations which have no representatives at Qumran or in  $\alpha'$   $\sigma'$ . In his selective study, Marbury found no single Palestinian Greek OT tradition but did find some Palestinian readings as well as a fluid Hebrew tradition underlying the quotations. The latter was discerned by the process of retroversion, p. 146. W. Stark, ZWT 35, 36 confined his study to the four gospels.



them to another set of specific passages.<sup>1</sup> The areas of the Greek OT which are presently most open to such clear definition are those for which one has DSS MSS evidence, especially in Greek. Those will yield early readings from which one can attempt to establish a sequential framework of textual development.

Given the basic structure of a Palestinian Greek OG which was progressively conformed to a MT Vorlage (the bare minimum of scholarly consensus today) we will see if Paul's quotations shed light on the nuances of the various current theories. Barthélemy<sup>2</sup> found that Justin's citations witnessed to a LXX text current from 70-135 A.D. It was this discovery that began to unlock several LXX problems. Paul's OT quotations can also be important witnesses to an early period of LXX transmission.

### Christian Interpolation

One problem which arises concerning the Greek OT MSS is that they may have been harmonized to a NT quotation form.<sup>3</sup> R. H. Charles, in his study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, found several examples of Christian interpolations. The last judgment was inter-

---

<sup>1</sup>D. W. Gooding, "A Recent Popularization Of Professor F. M. Cross' Theories On The Text Of The Old Testament," Tyndale Bulletin 26 (1975), pp. 120-22.

<sup>2</sup>Barthélemy, RB 60:19-21.

<sup>3</sup>Metzger, NTS 8:199, cautions that "we can never be sure on which side the borrowing may lie."

preted as the crucifixion; God's dwelling with men became His sending of the Son; the story of Benjamin became a prophecy of Christ from the hand of one editor and a prophecy of Saint Paul from another.<sup>1</sup> Christian interpolation is also found in the LXX and is a caveat for the textual critic.<sup>2</sup> Lindars<sup>3</sup> sees the validity of using textual modifications as indicators of editorial activity even though there may still be questions concerning the texts used. This has particular bearing on the discussion of the use of the OT in the NT. For a writer to change even one word of the LXX is significant because the LXX was considered to be an original and therefore to alter a word was to make the verse into a new one.<sup>4</sup> This can be seen in Peter Katz's study of the OT quotations in Philo. Katz notes that the LXX itself was a much revised text as were also Philo's quotations

---

<sup>1</sup>R. H. Charles, The Greek Versions Of The Testaments Of The Twelve Patriarchs (Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1908), p. xlvii.

<sup>2</sup>Wood, HDB, p. 188. Thomas, LXX in Heb., p. 281, gives an example in Heb. 1:5 where the καὶ of Paul's quote is found neither in Heb. nor LXX but appears in bghne<sub>2</sub> Sah. Eth Cyr. Theo. Cyp. Joseph Ziegler, ed., Septuaginta Duodecim Prophetæ XIII (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943), pp. 25ff, notes how Lk. 3:5 and Ro. 14:11 influenced Isa. 40:4 and 45:23 respectively. He shows that A contains several non-MT corrections, Q reflects more of the original text and Luc. has many alterations which approximate the MT.

<sup>3</sup>Barnabas Lindars, New Testament Apologetic (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961), p. 27.

<sup>4</sup>Sperber, JBL 54:78.

from the LXX. The OT lemmata seem to show Aquila-type readings in Philo and often disagree with the OT text-form which shows a LXX basis in the following expositions. The lemmata would have been more easily subject to later Christian revision whereas the text forms, being integrated into the exposition, would have tended to escape later edition and can therefore be used as evidence for the genuine texts used by Philo.<sup>1</sup> This phenomenon is not present in the text-forms of 1 and 2 Cor., however.

The quotations of the NT in general and Paul in particular show a preference for LXX<sup>A</sup>.<sup>2</sup> Swete attributes this to a text of "great antiquity, possibly a pre-Christian recension made in Syria" which underlies A.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Peter Katz, Philo's Bible (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1950), pp. 3-5. M. J. Suggs, "The Use Of Patristic Evidence In The Search For A Primitive New Testament Text," New Testament Studies 4 (1957-58), p. 140, notes a similar phenomenon: "Even medieval commentaries, which incorporated comments of early Fathers under lemmata of a later text, are less than thorough in revising the earlier forms to fit their own." See also Stendahl, SSM, p. 169, esp. n. 5, for NT influence on LXX tradition, and p. 180, where he notes that the presence of Aquila-like affinities in DSS minor prophets disproves Katz's assumptions.

<sup>2</sup>James A. Garrison, "Certain Aspects Of The Use Of The Old Testament In The Epistle Of Paul To The Romans" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 1970), pp. 384-85 and Swete, IOTG, p. 395. Stendahl has further refined this by showing that in Isa. Paul is close to A but in Lev. he shows F readings, SSM, p. 159. Also, because Paul shows no difference in text-forms in his epistles as he moved from city to city, Stendahl concludes Paul quoted from memory, SSM, p. 160.

<sup>3</sup>Swete, IOTG, p. 489. Swete concluded that the LXX text of Clement was more mixed than the NT writers, IOTG, p. 410. But Donald Alfred Hagner, The Use Of The

With the exception of obviously interpolated theological opinions, the LXX "should be regarded as a witness of a different Hebrew recension when it does not agree completely with the MT."<sup>1</sup>

One may find that a text has been edited if there is literalness in translating from the Hebrew text; if there are stylistic modifications to avoid hiatus or to remedy grammatical problems; or if there are interpretational changes.<sup>2</sup> However, it is misleading simply to ask if a quotation follows A or B because no LXX MS is homogeneous throughout. Katz<sup>3</sup> has shown that Isaiah B is the chief representative of Origen's Hexaplaric recension and the Minor Prophets of B show similar influences whereas A stands for the primitive text in Isa. and Minor Prophets. He points out that Job<sup>A</sup> may be Lucianic. In view of the number of quotations taken from Isaiah and the Psalms "it is obvious how irrelevant it is to count how many of them

---

Old And New Testaments In Clement Of Rome (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973), p. 68, has shown that the variants from AB are minimal and not consistent throughout which does not indicate that he was using another LXX text. D. Barthélemy, RB 60:18-29, considers the DS Habakkuk Greek text to be a revision of the LXX rather than a translation.

<sup>1</sup>Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Essays On The Semitic Background Of The New Testament (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971), p. 87.

<sup>2</sup>Bleddyn J. Roberts, The Old Testament Text And Versions (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1951), pp. 121; 155.

<sup>3</sup>Peter Katz, "The Quotations From Deuteronomy In Hebrews," Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 49 (1958), pp. 221-22.

follow B or A." He continues to say that "it is not only irrelevant, but misleading." In fact, the question to be asked is: "does a quotation follow the primitive text or an 'edited' one?"<sup>1</sup> The textual studies in this thesis seek to answer this question relative to 1 and 2 Cor.

---

<sup>1</sup>Katz, ZNW 49:222.

## CONCEPTUAL VECTORS

### JEWISH EXEGESIS IN FIRST CENTURY PALESTINE

#### Definition Of Terminology

The terms Midrash and Pesher are more and more commonly used with reference to the writings of portions of the NT<sup>1</sup> but often one is not precisely clear as to either what is the definition of the terms or what implication is being drawn regarding the biblical author's method of thought. The purpose of this section is to arrive at a satisfactory definition of Midrash and Pesher

---

<sup>1</sup>E. Earle Ellis, "Midrash, Targum And New Testament Quotations," from Neotestamentica Et Semitica, eds. E. Earle Ellis and Max Wilcox (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969), p. 61, notes that this is due to the "interest in biblical literary genres and in biblical hermeneutics generally" and by the evidence from Qumran, but "more importantly, it has been marked by a shift away from the rabbinical Midrashim as the standard by which the genre is to be defined or measured." Richard Longenecker, "Can We Reproduce The Exegesis Of The New Testament?," Tyndale Bulletin 21 (1970), pp. 3-38, has a review of early Jewish exegesis. Daniel Patte, Early Jewish Hermeneutic In Palestine (Missoula, Montana: Society Of Biblical Literature And Scholars Press, 1975) has a full work on the subject. For bibliographical aids see Peter Nickels, Targum And New Testament (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967), and, more recently, Bernard Grossfeld, A Bibliography Of Targum Literature (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1972). See Cross, ALQ, pp. 14-15, for a 50 B.C. to A.D. 50 date for 1Qp Heb.

sufficient for the use of these terms in the immediate study.

In Scripture the verb patar (פָּתַר) only appears throughout Genesis 40-41 where it is used nine times. The noun (פִּתְרוֹן) is also only used in Gen. 40-41 and occurs there five times. In Daniel פֶּשֶׁר (the Aramaic equivalent of פָּתַר) is used thirty times. In both literatures the term is used of the revealing of the true meaning of a dream or vision. To apply peshar to a dream involved relating the basic structure of the dream to a specific event.<sup>1</sup> Therefore within the Biblical data itself peshar relates to a divine revelation which infuses a dream or vision with meaning.<sup>2</sup> William Hugh Brownlee also noticed this use of peshar in Daniel and was the first to speak of the combined term Midrash-Peshar, later embraced by K. Stendahl.<sup>3</sup>

Matthew Black has called Midrash-Peshar "a modern invention probably best forgotten" because it introduces a false distinction within midrash-halakah and

---

<sup>1</sup>Asher Finkel, "The Peshar Of Dreams And Scriptures," Revue De Qumran 4 (1963-64), p. 357.

<sup>2</sup>B. Rigaux, "Révélation Des Mystères Et Perfection A Qumran Et Dans Le Nouveau Testament," New Testament Studies 4 (1957-58), p. 247, writes regarding Peshar that "il n'est pas une explication ni une explication du texte. Il contient une nouvelle révélation ajoutée au texte lui-même."

<sup>3</sup>William Hugh Brownlee, The Meaning Of The Qumran Scrolls For The Bible (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp. 64-65. Stendahl, SSM, passim.



midrash-haggadah.<sup>1</sup> In the plain sense of interpretation all midrash is pesher.<sup>2</sup>

There is a possible link between pesher as applied to dreams and as later applied to prophecy in the Rabbinic use of Lam. 2:9 and Num. 12:6 where, in the Petirah Midrashim, the Rabbis held that God spoke to all his prophets, except Moses, in dreams or visions.<sup>3</sup> This could be the formative concept that made all prophecy fair game for pesher interpretation. Even without such a link, however, it is not difficult to see how the apocalyptic mind could easily legitimize such a perspective by the implications of prophetic fulfillment in and of itself.

#### Identification Of Midrashic Exegesis

Often it is difficult to identify precisely a midrash. Attempts at interpreting the Bible are of course as old as the Bible itself. One finds Rabbinic type glosses which ante-date the LXX because they are

---

<sup>1</sup>Black, NTS 18:1, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup>Miller, JSJ, p. 51, supports the concept of pesher as Midrash, not a subcategory of it. José Faur, "The Targumim And Halakha," Jewish Quarterly Review 66, p. 21, says the distinction between Pesher (literal sense) and Derash (further exegetical elaboration of the text) is a late middle ages concept and therefore it is anachronistic to read it back into NT times.

<sup>3</sup>Lou H. Silberman, "Unriddling The Riddle," Revue De Qumran 3 (1961-62), pp. 330-31.



found in the LXX text itself.<sup>1</sup> Ellis<sup>2</sup> uses the term "explicit" to refer to a midrash with a lemma of OT text and "implicit" to refer to an "interpretive paraphrase." Both forms are found at Qumran.<sup>3</sup> Explicit and implicit relate to the type of midrash while the two major literary forms are the "specifying commentary" and the "implying paraphrase."<sup>4</sup> An overt midrash is relatively simple to identify. To find a covert midrash one must 1) locate the Scriptural text commented upon; 2) ascertain the meaning of the text established in the exegesis; and 3) identify the particular hermeneutical process involved in the interpretation.<sup>5</sup> Another way to understand the conceptuality behind a midrash is to ask what place the OT text has in the passage. Does it function as "an initial stimulus," a secondary place in the tradition, or a crucial foundation?<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>F. F. Bruce, Paul & Jesus (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1974), p. 188. See also Bruce's appended reply to Atkinson's article, JTVI 79:60-62, and J. Weingreen, "Exposition In The Old Testament And In Rabbinic Literature," from Promise And Fulfillment, ed. F. F. Bruce (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), pp. 187-201.

<sup>2</sup>Ellis, NS, p. 62; following M. Gertner, "Midrashim In The New Testament," Journal of Semitic Studies 7 (1962), pp. 267-92.

<sup>3</sup>Explicit; 1QpHab; 4QFlor; CD4:14. Implicit: Book of Jubilees (1Q17, 18; 2Q19, 20; 4Q and the Genesis Apocryphon). The latter is hard to categorize as either a targum or midrash; Ellis, NS, pp. 62-63.

<sup>4</sup>Gertner, JSS 7:268.      <sup>5</sup>Gertner, JSS 7:269.

<sup>6</sup>Miller, JSJ 2:44.

Addison G. Wright's article<sup>1</sup> has recently caused much controversy over what constitutes a midrash. In opposition to his concept of midrash as a literary genre, Miller is not happy that Wright excludes the Targums from midrashic literature because such exclusion overlooks the close presuppositional, historical, and methodological relationships between the two.<sup>2</sup> Wright's purpose is to narrow the meaning of midrash so that it will not be so comprehensive as to include other literature which may share its historical and presuppositional contexts but not its form. If the citation puts no emphasis on its interpretation then it is not a midrash. If it contributes to an understanding of the text then it may be termed midrashic.<sup>3</sup>

Roger Le Déaut finds that Wright has not made a correct choice in retaining the term midrash for this more narrow meaning but should have found another description.<sup>4</sup> Daniel Patte, in agreement with Roger Le Déaut also cannot accept Wright's more narrow perspec-

---

<sup>1</sup>Addison G. Wright, "The Literary Genre Midrash," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 28 (1966), pp. 105-38; 417-54.

<sup>2</sup>Miller, JSJ, 2:44.

<sup>3</sup>Wright, CBQ 28:439.

<sup>4</sup>Roger Le Déaut, "A Propos D'Une Définition Du Midrash," Biblica 50 (1969), p. 398. See ET by Mary C. Howard in Interpretation No. 3, 25 (1971), pp. 259-82. Paul Ricoeur, "Biblical Hermeneutics," Semeia 4 (1975), p. 69, speaking against French structuralism, writes that a literary genre "is not a means of classification, but a means of production."

tive. Patte writes regarding midrash in the first century A.D.:

It has a broader sense, mainly in the period we are considering. Therefore we cannot use Wright's definition of the term, which is a projection upon the past of the later literary genre. We use the term to express an attitude toward Scripture.<sup>1</sup>

This conception of midrash as an attitude toward life and the Bible is defined in Le Déaut's writing as "exegetical method." That method which lies at the base of early Jewish exegesis will therefore act as a more fundamental criterion of midrash than literary form.<sup>2</sup> This, in effect, defines midrash in accord with what it does (for example, contemporizing the sacred text)<sup>3</sup> rather than what it looks like (literary form). After reviewing current study on this topic, Merrill Miller offers a workable method of identification:

I think the minimum requirement for the use of this term as a substantive will be the presence of a literary unit to which the biblical citations or allusions clearly belong as formative elements at some stage in the development of that literary unit. But it would still be correct, as Le Déaut points out, to refer to midrashic tendencies and procedures in the use of Scripture even where such a literary unit is not present.<sup>4</sup>

One standing outside of the field of Jewish and Rabbinic specialization can only examine what Paul has done on

---

<sup>1</sup>Patte, EJH, p. 117, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup>Le Déaut, Bib 50:405.

<sup>3</sup>Silberman, RQ 3:324-25.

<sup>4</sup>Miller, JSJ 2:44.

both attitudinal, exegetical and formal levels and see how this data relates to the conclusions of the scholars of Rabbinics and early Jewish literature. This paper will utilize the substantival and adjectival definitions of midrash as formulated by Le Déaut and outlined by Miller.

### Chronological Relationships

Because we are using a more conceptual rather than formal description of midrash when examining Paul's quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. it must be asked to what extent do the works of the Midrashim and Rabbinics give insight into the conceptualities and methods which were formulative to Paul's writings? While volumes have been written on this subject, the purpose of this section will be to clarify the specific problems pertinent to this study as a guide to the application of a methodology which will allow an accurate comparison of Pauline with Jewish literature while leaving both groups undistorted in their respective genres, contextual nuances, and chronological relationships. One obvious as well as critical foundation of linguistic comparison is the establishment of an accurate temporal relationship between the members compared. In the case of this study, Jewish literature which is contemporaneous, or nearly so, with the life of Paul would have the potential for making the most telling comparisons. Another more pertinent consideration, made possible by ascertaining the temporal

relationship, is that of the demonstrable effect of one literature upon another.

These two aspects enter into the heart of a significant problem concerning the relationship between Paul and Judaism: the available Rabbinic texts stem from a period of final redaction significantly later than the Apostle. A firm continuity has to be assumed between pre-A.D. 70 and post-A.D. 70 Judaism in order for cogent interrelationships to be made but it is just this assumption that is still open to question.

To be sure, the actual date of origin of a considerable part of the rabbinical corpus is earlier than its first redaction<sup>1</sup> and can contain material prior to or contemporary with Paul but this proves to be a perilous hope when one realizes the great difficulties involved in ascertaining the specific early pericopae. There is a basic lack of critical work on the extra-biblical materials of Judaism.<sup>2</sup>

Dating of the Sources. The practice of Targumism is viable in NT times because it probably began in the days of Ezra<sup>3</sup> but, with the basic lack of critical works

---

<sup>1</sup>Bamberger, JBL 68:115.

<sup>2</sup>Anthony D. York, "The Dating Of Targumic Literature," Journal for the Study of Judaism 5 (1974), passim, contends that no method exists for dating the various traditions underneath Targumic texts.

<sup>3</sup>Neh. 8:8.

on the Targums,<sup>1</sup> one is not on the surest ground when asserting the early date of a particular pericope. Allen Wikgren adds one more methodological consideration:

An indiscriminate, uncritical, and eclectic citation of evidence, apart from consideration of context and time of composition, will not suffice, whether made from original texts or from secondary compilations. In fact, such procedure in the past has been largely responsible for both the misuse and disuse of the Targums as sources of information for the early Christian period.<sup>2</sup>

Paul Kahle offered a general chronological framework when he asserted the priority of the Jerusalem Targum to that of Onkelos.<sup>3</sup> He becomes more specific by placing the origin of Onkelos in Babylon and a date not before A.D. 1000 for its introduction into Palestine.<sup>4</sup> McNamara argues for an early date for the Palestinian Targum on the basis of its borrowings from Greek.<sup>5</sup> He is convinced that this Targum, especially as represented by Neofiti I, has a pre-Christian origin.<sup>6</sup> When one is confronted with the Isaiah Targum a similar problem of dating is present. J. F. Stenning writes that a date not earlier than the fifth century A.D. can be given for the final written

---

<sup>1</sup>Allen Wikgren, "The Targums And The New Testament," Journal of Religion 24 (1944), pp. 94-95.

<sup>2</sup>Wikgren, JR 24:93.

<sup>3</sup>Kahle, CG<sup>2</sup>, p. 194.

<sup>4</sup>Kahle, CG<sup>2</sup>, p. 195.

<sup>5</sup>McNamara, TT, p. 61.

<sup>6</sup>McNamara, TT, chap. 8, pp. 36-89 and McNamara, NTPT, p. 257, for a summary of his evidence for an early date.

form.<sup>1</sup>

The dating<sup>2</sup> and affinities of Targums with the NT have been given much detailed examination,<sup>3</sup> and the problems are not new. Though their antiquity has been a supposition from as early as the 17th century,<sup>4</sup> the confirmatory proof of early Targumic MSS is lacking; thus weakening the value in NT research. Their use at present, until such time as further research or discovery provides direct evidence, must be guided by a careful comparison with material whose early date has been established (e.g. NT, Philo, Qumran, Ps. Philo, Josephus). On this basis there is optimism that, on one front of research, "an early date for much of the PT tradition can be established."<sup>5</sup>

Since the time of G. F. Moore there has been a shift in the direction of haggadic and halachic studies.

---

<sup>1</sup>J. F. Stenning, The Targum of Isaiah (Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1949), p. vii.

<sup>2</sup>Roger Le Déaut, La Nuit Pascale (Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1963), pp. 41-71, gives the criteria for dating rabbinic material and the PT. In a recent study Le Déaut, "The Current State Of Targumic Studies," Biblical Theology Bulletin 4 (1974), pp. 23-24, stresses that one must 1) distinguish between content or traditions and literary forms, and 2) note that the recent features only give the terminus ad quem.

<sup>3</sup>See the examples given in Peter Nickels, Targum And New Testament. A Bibliography Together With A New Testament Index (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967).

<sup>4</sup>Martin McNamara, "Targumic Studies," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 28 (1966), p. 3.

<sup>5</sup>Miller, JSJ 2:31.



Onkelos and Jonathan are now seen by some to contain pre-Christian material rather than to be cursorily dismissed as exclusively second century A.D. or later Tannaitic material.<sup>1</sup> Vermes classifies early Targumic literature in two groups. The Fragmentary and Yerushalmi Targums with Codex Neofiti (N) are called early Haggadah, being placed in the second century A.D. The second group is classified according to its form:

. . . the original haggadic unit covering the entire Torah section is either split into shorter interpretations to expound the passage verse by verse, as in the Targum of PS.-Jonathan, or else its commentary is inserted into the completely re-written biblical narrative, as in Jubilees, Genesis Apocryphon, Jewish Antiquities, and Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum.<sup>2</sup>

This second group is of a later and more developed date.

Kahle argued for an early date of the PT over Onkelos and was followed by Diez Macho and McNamara.<sup>3</sup> Diez Macho<sup>4</sup> presents his arguments for an early date for the PT on textual, historical, and geographical grounds. He argues that the geographical names in N point to a

---

<sup>1</sup>Geza Vermes, Scripture And Tradition In Judaism (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961), pp. 1-10.

<sup>2</sup>Vermes, STJ, pp. 228-29.

<sup>3</sup>Smith, UOTN, p. 12. Stendahl, SSM, p. 175, notes that this school "draws more essential inferences from the fact that we are here dealing with a sacred literature which had been widespread and demanded a translation for its cultic function."

<sup>4</sup>A. Diez Macho, "The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum: Its Antiquity And Relationship With The Other Targums," Supplement To Vetus Testamentum VII, (1959), pp. 229-45.





second century A.D. date for its last recension. The use of λαβὼν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ of Acts 15:4 with reference to baptismal rites is not found in the MT or the LXX but is usual in the PT. The spelling "Rabbuni" in the gospels is not in Rabbinic texts but is common in PT and the Sam. Targum. While Diez Macho lists other evidence to support the early date for the PT and N in particular the argument which he calls the "surest way" to detect the early origin of N is to find its Hebrew Vorlage. His evidence shows that the Hebrew below N is not the MT but a pre-masoretic text.<sup>1</sup> This, Diez Macho concludes, is an indication that N was produced before the MT had gained ascendancy c. A. D. 200. He also finds that Onkelos is based on the MT and that Ps. Jonathan is a PT "more or

---

<sup>1</sup>Macho, VT 7:233-36. It is just at this point that P. Wernberg-Møller, "An Inquiry Into The Validity Of The Text-Critical Argument For An Early Dating Of The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum," Vetus Testamentum 12 (1962), p. 312, finds the most telling inadequacies in Macho's methodology. Wernberg-Møller's detailed article shows a non-MT Vorlage for N to be questionable. He does not, however, refute the fact that N can contain early material. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Catholic Biblical Quarterly 32 (1970), pp. 107-12, in his review of Diez Macho, seconds Wernberg-Møller's conclusions and points out further editorial peculiarities of Macho's work. York, JSJ 5:57, follows Wernberg-Møller and asserts that both PT and Onkelos contain early material. Abraham O. H. Okamoto, "A Geonic Phrase In Ms Targum Yerushalmi, Codex Neofiti I," Jewish Quarterly Review 66 (1976), p. 101, has doubts as to whether N is a Targum at all or merely a clumsy copy. But might not a Targum be called a paraphrase of varying quality anyway? Bernard J. Bamberger, "Halakic Elements In The Neofiti Targum: A Preliminary Statement," Jewish Quarterly Review (1975), p. 28, takes a mediating position.

less consistently modified"<sup>1</sup> by the Onkelos text. With regard to the ascendancy of Onkelos over N, Le Déaut writes:

Nous pensons d'ailleurs que la recension du Codex Neofiti, à cause des nombreuses retouches qu'il trahit, a pu avoir en Palestine une situation quasi officielle avant d'être supplanté par le targum de babylone.<sup>2</sup>

McNamara concludes that N represents a "very old text of the PT" which was known to the rabbis of Palestine and was also edited by them to conform it to their laws.

"The basis of N would then be very old," writes McNamara, "but its present recension is from later Talmudic times."<sup>3</sup>

The liturgical form of the PT would also be an indication of its early date. Le Déaut, who holds that the PT contains pre-Christian material, finds a great resemblance between the Mekilta and the PT which is to be explained by their common origin in the ancient liturgy.<sup>4</sup> Daniel Patte<sup>5</sup> and Geza Vermes<sup>6</sup> also see the

---

<sup>1</sup>Macho, RDPT, p. 239.

<sup>2</sup>R. Le Déaut, Liturgie Juive Et Nouveau Testament (Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1965), p. 73.

<sup>3</sup>McNamara, NTPT, p. 63. Le Déaut, Bib 42:29, sees the content of the PT to be prior to Christianity. Moise Ohana, "Prosélytisme et Targum Palestinien: Données Nouvelles Pour La Datation De Néofiti 1," Biblica 55 (1974), p. 332, concludes that the use of the verb gwr and substantive ger in N shows a pre-mishnaic and midrash-halakic evolution. This concurs with Faur, JQR 66:20 who assigns the Halakah in N to a pre-mishnaic period.

<sup>4</sup>Le Déaut, NP, p. 131, n. 2.

<sup>5</sup>Patte, EJH, p. 87.

<sup>6</sup>Vermes, STJ, p. 228.

common life situation of the synagogue to stand behind the tradition of the PT. This liturgical source of the PT is apparent in the nature of its paraphrase. McNamara calls this an early type of form which probably arose "at a time when the homily was not yet distinct from the translation of the Scriptures into the vernacular."<sup>1</sup> It may be concluded that in the absence of positive evidence to the contrary, the portions of haggadah in the PT probably antedate the Jewish uprising of A.D. 132.<sup>2</sup> Therefore this literature will be carefully used as an influencing factor in Paul's quotations.

The Targums, however, can only be the final products of a process of tradition. A Targum in its early stages and by its very nature went through many revisions and certainly its first attempt generally showed no high critical standard.<sup>3</sup> Each subsequent scribe improved as he copied.<sup>4</sup> Therefore a standard text would probably arise as a final product of a tradition rather than an early development. Therefore any study which specifically seeks to investigate textual relationships may, even while in the middle of an early Rabbinical passage, be unknowingly confronted with an actually late set of textual

---

<sup>1</sup>McNamara, NTPT, p. 64.

<sup>2</sup>G. Vermes, "Bible And Midrash: Early Old Testament Exegesis," from The Cambridge History Of The Bible I, eds. P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1970), p. 231.

<sup>3</sup>Kahle, CG<sup>2</sup>, p. 236.

<sup>4</sup>Kahle, CG<sup>2</sup>, p. 236.

details. The lack of critical works on Rabbinics makes this an especially vulnerable area of weakness.

Midrashic Literature. An early date for the Mekilta of Rabbi Ishmael is held by many scholars.<sup>1</sup> Ben Zion Wacholder himself claims an eighth century date because the Mekilta utilizes "masterfully the hermeneutics of the Tannaim and Amoraim to summarize the talmudic halakah and haggadah pertaining to the book of Exodus."<sup>2</sup> Most authors, however, claim a second century date for the midrash.<sup>3</sup>

Mishnaic Literature. The Mishnah offers early material but this also lies hidden behind the screen of redaction history. In a discussion of Rabbi Judah the Patriarch,<sup>4</sup> Herbert Danby writes:

Much of Rabbi's material may go back to a time before or not long after the destruction of the Temple. Thus the tractates Middoth and Yoma which deal with the structure and the cultus of the Temple are, according to a reliable source, Yom. 16a, derived (so far as their anonymous contents are concerned) respectively from Eliezer ben Jacob and Simeon of Mizpah, both of whom lived at a time when the Temple was still standing.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See Ben Zion Wacholder, "The Date Of The Mekilta De-Rabbi Ishmael," Hebrew Union College Annual 30 (1968), p. 117, n. 1, for references.

<sup>2</sup>Wacholder, HUCA 30:144.

<sup>3</sup>Jacob Z. Lauterbach, Mekilta I (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1933), p. xviii, asserts it to be one of the oldest midrashim.

<sup>4</sup>b. A.D. 135.

<sup>5</sup>Herbert Danby, The Mishnah (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), pp. xxi-xxii. On p. xxii he points

W. S. Towner writes that the houses-disputes are thought to be the earliest strata of Midrashic and Mishnaic literature.<sup>1</sup> Once again, while these guidelines may prove to be helpful in methodological and contextual comparisons they are not sound for textual studies. Martin McNamara concludes:

The importance of all this rabbinical material for an understanding of the New Testament is undoubtedly immense. While receiving its final redaction in the Christian era, much of it can be presumed to go back to pre-Christian times. A large element of uncertainty remains, nonetheless, with regard to the dating of any particular passage.<sup>2</sup>

### Formal Relationships

When one moves from the dating of particular Jewish works and their various strands to the dating and relating of Jewish exegesis and literary forms, he is confronted with a similar problem, though the Qumran literature has narrowed the chronological question somewhat. As has been stated earlier, Rabbinic evidence is not primary evidence for first-century Judaism. The Talmud and Midrash are post-A.D. 70 Judaism.<sup>3</sup>

---

to Shekalim 5:1 as bearing "indications of a pre-Destruction origin," and to Bikkurim 3:2-6 which may point to Agrippa. Morton Smith, JBL 82:170, notes that the early parts of the Mishnah are the historical rather than halakic sections. This is important for the 2 Cor. 8:21 quotation.

<sup>1</sup>Wayne Sibley Towner, The Rabbinic "Enumeration Of Scriptural Examples" (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973), p. 27, n. 4, continued from p. 26.

<sup>2</sup>McNamara, TT, p. 11.      <sup>3</sup>Ellis, PUOT, pp. 42-43.

A common basis of comparison between Paul and Judaism is that of Midrash. Even in the earliest part of the LXX, the Pentateuch, which was the first section to be translated, Midrashic elements are to be found.<sup>1</sup> This places the form into the third century B.C. but it could also be attributed to first century A.D. editions.<sup>2</sup> In speaking of the methods of the Mishnah which reflect early Tannaitic style, Metzger writes that "much of the NT and of the Mishnah reflects the methods of argumentation employed by those who had been reared and trained in Orthodox Judaism of the first century."<sup>3</sup> Therefore both midrashic and mishnaic elements can be placed contemporaneously with Paul.<sup>4</sup>

Whether these were used by the writers of the NT is another question. A. G. Wright, in a helpful but controversial article, notes that in the Qumran literature midrash had come to signify "interpretation" in a sense similar to the verb *drš*.<sup>5</sup> He asserts, relative to identi-

---

<sup>1</sup>D. W. Gooding, "On the Use of the LXX for Dating Midrashic Elements in the Targums," The Journal of Theological Studies ns. 25 (1974), p. 1.

<sup>2</sup>Gooding, JTS 25:1.

<sup>3</sup>Bruce M. Metzger, "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the New Testament and the Mishnah," Journal of Biblical Literature 70 (1951), p. 297.

<sup>4</sup>Wright, CBQ 28:113, points to 2 Chr. 13:22; 24:27, for the first use of *midrāš*.

<sup>5</sup>Wright, CBQ 28:117. Midrash was a more general term than *peshar* and was not a technical biblical term. He makes a clarification that *peshar* is not a third type



fying a piece of literature with this tradition, that "to the degree, then, that the precise traditions followed by a work can be ascertained, its classification is sure."<sup>1</sup> His word "precise" is significant. It is not enough to find a midrashic element, whether conceptual or formal, in the NT and use this as a basis for relationship to Judaism. The NT work must conform as a whole to the sought after genre. The point becomes further refined when Wright, as noted above, states that Midrash is a genre and not a method of exegesis.<sup>2</sup> His description of this genre obviates the fact that its presence goes beyond the bounds of Judaistic literature. Midrash, he writes, "begins with a text of Scripture and proceeds to comment on it in some way" with a view to making the Bible relevant to the present.<sup>3</sup> Wright can therefore conclude:

The techniques of exegesis found in Rabbinic midrash are not among the primary characteristics of the literary form, and one is not justified in demanding that a literary work must employ one or another of these techniques before it can be called a midrash.<sup>4</sup>

To put it another way, a successful demonstration of a

---

to those of Halakah and Haggadah but is rather a sub-head of Haggadah, p. 422.

<sup>1</sup>Wright, CBQ 28:111.

<sup>2</sup>Wright, CBQ 28:120-21. He lists three types of midrashim; exegetical, homiletic and narrative, pp. 126-28.

<sup>3</sup>Wright, CBQ 28:133-34.      <sup>4</sup>Wright, CBQ 28:135.



midrashic form in 1 or 2 Corinthians is not, in itself, proof of the presence of a particularly rabbinical method of exegesis. To this extent, Wright's conclusions are pertinent to this study.

### Conceptual Relationships

World View. It is well known that Paul used the methods commonly related to Hillel in his use of the OT in order "to gain from the text new meanings by a process of inference and combination with other texts."<sup>1</sup> It is just such a process of inference that is at the core of Paul's hermeneutic and which is so determinative in his use of the OT.<sup>2</sup> Paul's practical intentions for using the OT were the same as those of Judaism: "to fuse Scripture with life."<sup>3</sup> When this fusion resulted in

---

<sup>1</sup>H. J. Schoeps, Paul, ET Harold Knight (London: Lutterworth Press, 1961), p. 39. It must be noted, however, that the rules of Hillel show the influence of the Hellenistic rhetoric of Cicero and were "entirely in line with the prevalent Hellenistic ideas on the matter;" David Daube, "Rabbinic Methods Of Interpretation And Hellenistic Rhetoric," Hebrew Union College Annual 22 (1949), pp. 246ff.

<sup>2</sup>Sandmel, HUCA 15:234, when contrasting Philo and the Rabbis, says that the essential difference can be found in their "different inferences from a common Biblical basis." Wilfred L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1925), p. 126, speaks of similarities consisting in the quotation of a common passage only, but with difference of conceptuality.

<sup>3</sup>Vermes, STJ, p. 229. See also J. Weingreen, "The Rabbinic Approach To The Study Of The Old Testament;" reprint from Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 34, no. 1 (Aberdeen: The University Press, September, 1951), p. 190.

regulative principles it was called halakic.<sup>1</sup> A result having no "direct legal consequence, bearing no immediate practical effect, and carrying no normative authority,"<sup>2</sup> was labeled an haggadic tradition. There was, however, no sharp break between the Haggadic and Halakic literatures.<sup>3</sup> The thrust of these fusions of Scripture with life was determined by the underlying conceptions about life and religion. The very presence in Judaism of written and oral Torah shows how pervasive was the need for fusion and how determinative and persistent the underlying conceptualities. Neusner writes regarding the oral and written laws:

The sole reciprocal relationship we can describe, therefore, is conceptual, or, in a loose sense of the word, metaphysical. And here the relationship is amazingly close. The two Torahs complement one another, balance and complete the conceptions of one another. The world-view of the one invites and instigates the reflections which lay the foundations of the other.<sup>4</sup>

This world-view issued in the bringing of the sense of an OT text into line with present teachings;<sup>5</sup> or, more specifically, making the commands of the OT possible in present circumstances. Two elements were involved: the intent of

---

<sup>1</sup>Strack, ITM, p. 202.      <sup>2</sup>Neusner, RT III, p. 43.

<sup>3</sup>Max Kadushin, A Conceptual Approach To The Mekilta (New York: Jonathan David Publishers, 1969), p. 22. See also Doeve, JHSG, pp. 42-48 and p. 56, n. 2.

<sup>4</sup>Neusner, ERJ, p. 29. See Weingreen, BJRL 34, #1:166, who also speaks of the "attitude of mind" present in Jewish commentators.

<sup>5</sup>Weingreen, BJRL 34, #1:190.

the OT and reality of the present. These are also seen in Paul's hermeneutic. Just as with the Jew, Paul's conceptions and understanding of the present formulated his understanding of the OT.<sup>1</sup> Christian Dietzfelbinger concludes:

Denn die rabbinische Methode gibt dem, der mit ihr umgeht und sich in ihr versteht, nur eine bestimmte, in dieser Methode liegende Fähigkeit, das vorgegebene Material zu formen zu dem Zweck, den der Exeget verfolgt. Diesem Zweck gegenüber ist die Methode als solche indifferent.<sup>2</sup>

To have a firm grasp on Paul's concept of the reality of his present will aid in avoiding the attribution of inaccurate editorial motivation to his use of the OT and will provide a basis for discerning the reasons for his editorial work when a textual basis for his OT quotations seems improbable.

### Conceptual Determinants

With the difficulties of dating rabbinical methodology arises the place of conceptualization of religious and historical data in the formulation of exegetical conclusions. The midrash form may be used by two writers but the conclusions reached by them will be mainly depen-

---

<sup>1</sup>Dan O. Via, "A Structuralist Approach To Paul's Old Testament," Interpretation 28 (1974), p. 202, speaking regarding structuralism, calls structure the "hidden or underlying configuration that can offer some explanation for the more or less visible or obvious pattern in the text."

<sup>2</sup>Christian Dietzfelbinger, "Paulus Und Das Alte Testament," Theologische Existenz Heute (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1961), p. 33.

dent on their religio-historical perspective.

The Mekilta. Max Kadushin, in a work concentrating on the Mekilta of Rabbi Ishmael, evaluates this midrash and concludes that it contains several emphasized trends: the individual's free access to religion, universality, and the closely knit combination of experiencing love and God.<sup>1</sup> His point is that the "coherence of rabbinic concepts is organismic."<sup>2</sup> The technical haggadic structures of an early midrash, the Mekilta, display an exegesis, rather than exposition, which was based on word-plays, syntax, and spelling.<sup>3</sup> Kadushin supplies the ideology behind this exegetical structure and the conceptual framework within which the content of the Mekilta was unified:

For a haggadic idea the stimulus is usually a biblical text. In other words, though haggadic ideas [God's love, justice, kinship, etc.] are derived from biblical verses, the ideas have not been derived through rules of interpretation but are largely the result of the impact of the verses on creative minds. As stimulus, however, the verse is not just a point of departure for the haggadic idea. Instead, the verse acts as a channel for bringing out the idea and, by the same token, the idea is a construction or interpretation of the verse. The interpretation is certainly something other than the plain meaning of the verse; nevertheless, in midrash there is an association between the interpretation and the plain meaning - an immediate and an ultimate association. The immediate association is obvious: the words of the plain meaning give rise to the interpretation, but that alone does not make the interpretation midrash. In midrash there is also an ultimate association. Now it is not a matter of the relation between

---

<sup>1</sup>Kadushin, CAM, p. 8.

<sup>2</sup>Kadushin, CAM, p. 17.

<sup>3</sup>Lauterbach, Mek. I, p. lvii.

a single biblical verse and its haggadic interpretation; the association is between the Bible as a whole and rabbinic thought as a whole. An intrinsic conceptual bond unites the Bible and rabbinic thought, the bond of relationship between the rabbinic concepts and their biblical antecedents.<sup>1</sup>

More important than literary forms, therefore, in relating Paul to the literature of Judaism, is the comparison of their conceptions regarding man and God.

Religious Tradition. It is at this very point of world-view that great differences are seen between Pauline and Rabbinical concepts.<sup>2</sup> C. G. Montefiore saw Paul's divergence from the rabbis to be due to the apostle's Diaspora perspective.<sup>3</sup> W. D. Davies refuted this notion by showing that Montefiore was too idealistic with regard to Palestinian Judaism and asserted that Jerusalem could have provided whatever pessimism and emotionalism may be found in Paul's theology.<sup>4</sup>

Several basic presuppositions also parted the way between Paul and Rabbinics. Foremost among these is Paul's Christo-centric rather than Torah-centric perspective<sup>5</sup> which may explain Paul's remarkably few statements

---

<sup>1</sup>Kadushin, CAM, pp. 20-21.

<sup>2</sup>Differences can be as important and illuminating as similarities; Sandmel, HUCA 15:221.

<sup>3</sup>C. G. Montefiore, Judaism And St. Paul (London: Max Goschen Ltd., 1914).

<sup>4</sup>Davies, PRJ, pp. 5-16.

<sup>5</sup>Gerhardsson, MM, p. 225.

about the oral Torah of Judaism.<sup>1</sup> The fact that Paul had the Messiah's life before him as history radically altered the messianic views which he had held as part of his cultural milieu.<sup>2</sup> For Paul, his own revelations and the apostolic traditions were the framework within which he developed his exegesis. This exegesis is hard to root immediately in Judaism.<sup>3</sup> Both Johnson and Ellis find only superficial resemblance between Paul and Judaism. The resemblances relate to technicalities such as IF and literary forms of quotation rather than to interpretational principles and actual exegesis.<sup>4</sup> Johnson writes that " . . . the resemblance is chiefly in appearance, when the reader pierces below the surface, he finds little of it; . . ."<sup>5</sup>

The strong individual character of early Christian exegesis as demonstrated in the NT can safely be said to be due to the pervasive and consistent impression of the Christ. The Christian tradition, when related to the OT, was not simply a conceptual ideal but rather a reality which was determinative to the whole kerygma of first century Christianity.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Gerhardsson, MM, p. 289.      <sup>2</sup>Toy, QNT, p. xxiv.

<sup>3</sup>Ellis, PUOT, p. 58.      <sup>4</sup>Ellis, PUOT, p. 83.

<sup>5</sup>Franklin Johnson, The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old (London: Baptist Tract and Book Society, 1896), p. 379.

<sup>6</sup>Gerhardsson, MM, p. 234.

This reality had a narrowing effect hermeneutically upon the exegesis of the OT. Whereas the rabbinical literature offered little to keep the interpreter from finding whatever he wanted in Scripture<sup>1</sup> the NT writers seem to be purposely limited in their use of the OT to the actual event of Jesus and the specifics of His new ethic. This is best expressed in the Christological clustering of OT proof-texts in the NT around specific OT passages<sup>2</sup> or possibly testimonia.<sup>3</sup>

Certain middot are found both in early haggadic and halakic literature<sup>4</sup> and are used by Paul as well. Merged quotations, though few, are common to Paul and the Rabbis.<sup>5</sup> Certainly both Paul and the Rabbis began with a general awareness of the plain meaning of the biblical data.<sup>6</sup> Beyond these similarities, however, further hermeneutical correspondence is not easily adduced. Paul was one man at one time while the Rabbis were many and from many times. Samuel Sandmel's words regarding comparative studies in Philonic material well apply to such endeavors with Paul: "For the comparison to be the most

---

<sup>1</sup>Toy, QNT, p. xxii.

<sup>2</sup>Dodd, AS. See below pp. 409ff.

<sup>3</sup>J. Rendel Harris, Testimonies, 2 Vols. (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1916-20). See below pp. 404ff.

<sup>4</sup>Towner, RESE, pp. 251-55.

<sup>5</sup>Ellis, PUOT, p. 53.

<sup>6</sup>Kadushin, CAM, p. 7.



reliable, it would need to assess the imponderable measure of the heterogeneity with<sup>n</sup> the milieu of the rabbis."<sup>1</sup> But "an assumption of total, all-embracing homogeneity among the rabbis is gratuitous."<sup>2</sup>

### Conclusion

With this great diversity<sup>3</sup> between Paul and the Rabbis conceptually, and the methodological pitfalls due to gaps in rabbinical criticism, one must ask what legitimate place can rabbinics play in a study of Paul's use of the OT in 1 and 2 Corinthians. One specific benefit of a detailed comparison will be in the area of the history of religious thought. Paul and the Rabbis were engaged in a similar task; that of keeping alive and relevant a religious perspective of life. A return to Max Kadushin's book will show this similarity:

Since value concepts do not refer to objects or relations in common sensory experience, they need to be cultivated, nurtured. Even more vital is the need to establish norms of behavior ensuring the steady concretization of the value concepts, norms whereby the opportunities for actualizing the concepts discovered by the gifted man, may become similar opportunities for the ordinary man. These needs were met by the Rabbis, the trained intellectual leaders of the people who nevertheless did not constitute a professional class, and whose interests were therefore largely the same as those of the folk. In Haggadah they made the value concepts vivid, and in Halakah they developed the norms which developed and directed the steady actualization of those concepts in daily life.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Sandmel, HUCA 15:213.

<sup>2</sup>Sandmel, PPJ, p. 213.

<sup>3</sup>Ellis, PUOT, p. 83.

<sup>4</sup>Kadushin, CAM, p. 30.

A comparison with the Apostle's nearest religious counterpart can show how Paul conceived and executed his role as promulgator of the Christian faith in the Corinthian Epistles.

Secondly, the Jewish tradition may be used to provide insight into possible targumic renderings of OT passages in Paul. Septuagintal readings in later MSS leave open the possibility of conformity to the Pauline version, whereas this is less likely to have occurred in the middle of a Jewish tractate. The presence of a text-form of Paul's OT quote in the text of a Jewish piece of literature would argue quite strongly against an ad hoc Pauline quotation.

Finally, comparisons between Pauline and Rabbinic exegetical methodology and literary forms will be at a minimum both due to the present state of rabbinical criticism and because such comparisons are not central to this paper. Each case will have to be treated separately and interpretive or literary cross-checks will be made with other writers where possible. Care will be exercised to be precise in the use of terminology such as midrash or pesher, the differentiation between form and method, and the implicational use of underlying conceptual forces. With an author who so expressly states his complete break with his rabbinical heritage<sup>1</sup> we do not

---

<sup>1</sup>Phil. 3:8.

expect to find close parallels of content and the evidence to be examined seems to support this.

## MODERN EXEGESIS IN OT IN NT STUDIES

### Introduction

In studies of Paul's use of the OT, one's conceptions of the nature of first-century Christian piety affect, in a substantial manner, one's conclusions regarding Pauline hermeneutic. These conclusions are valid as long as the theological suppositions are consistent with the full range of available textual data. A brief survey of several notable authors will show the results of various theological emphases on their conclusions. This chronological survey does not include all works relative to this subject, but is limited to those authors who have written major and formative studies specifically dealing with the hermeneutical and textual influences on Paul's use of the OT. Other studies will be evaluated throughout the paper.

### Harnack (1928) And Michel (1929)

In a paradigmatic essay, Harnack has rightly emphasized the interpretive light which the cross shed on the OT and concluded that Paul's piety found its source in the gospel and the Spirit rather than the OT.<sup>1</sup> One

---

<sup>1</sup>Adolf von Harnack, "Das Alte Testament In Den

feels, however, that Harnack underemphasized the explicit use of the OT in the NT by limiting such use solely to confrontation with the Jews.

Michel<sup>1</sup> supported that aspect of Harnack's view which emphasized the cross-illuminated place of Paul's view of the OT but questioned the limiting factor of Jewish conflict. Harnack traced the beginning of the overestimation of the OT as a book of piety for Christian growth to the phrase ἐγράφη δὲ πρὸς νοουθεσίαν ἡμῶν of 1 Cor. 10:11, but stressed that in Paul's intentions this was only incidental (beilaüfig). The quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. will show that this was not merely an incidental statement of Paul but, on the contrary, revealed a foundational and pervasive approach to the OT. Pauline piety as outlined by Harnack is not consistent with the evidence at hand in 1 and 2 Cor.

It will become evident that Paul used the Greek OT for his own devotion and not just for apologetic purposes. Also, Paul's piety did not perceive a fundamental tension between the OT and Christian devotion whether or not in apologetic contexts.<sup>2</sup> A critical

---

Paulinischen Briefen Und In Den Paulinischen Gemeinden," Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, (1928), pp. 124-37.

<sup>1</sup>Michel, PSB, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup>Michel also does not see a tension here or in the accounts of Acts. Paul can speak of a continuity between the OT and NT because "er innerlich wirklich an das A.T. und die alttestamentliche Frömmigkeit gebunden ist;"

response to this view of continuity is raised by Herbert Ulonka who questions whether Paul was in such a strict continuity with Judaism and if, as we would also assert, this conclusion arises from proper exegetical methodology. Such continuity, Ulonka argues, causes the OT to speak against itself in, say, 2 Cor. 3 concerning the midrash on the veil.<sup>1</sup> The issue, however, has been blurred in Ulonka's critique due to his lack of distinction between a resolved continuity from the OT to the NT in the mind of Paul and the comparison and contrast of such a continuity with the Judaism of his day. To speak of the latter is, of course, to find great discontinuity but this must not be interpolated into the Pauline conceptuality. If anything, 2 Cor. 3 heightens and confirms continuity rather than the opposite. Paul had found what he thought was the correct interpretation and application of a passage of Scripture. Though it was not in harmony with the currently held view, his methodology may be impugned but not his sense of continuity. It may certainly be asked whether Paul's piety before and after his conversion was contradictory, but this would not necessarily affect his final sense of continuity.

Michel conceives three aims adopted by the

---

PSB, pp. 17; 130-31.

<sup>1</sup>Herbert Ulonka, "Die Funktion Der Alttestamentlichen Zitate Und Anspielungen In Den Paulinischen Briefen," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Münster, 1963).

writers of the NT: 1) to overthrow the old religion; 2) to support the new religion from the selected kernel of the OT; 3) to interpret Jesus and prove His Messiahship.<sup>1</sup> These three aspects may be applied both to the Synagogue community of Acts and the Gentile Christian community of Paul's letters.<sup>2</sup> While there is no proof of the Messiahship of Jesus in 1 and 2 Cor., the second of the three aims outlined by Michel provides a general category for the uses of the OT in 1 and 2 Cor.

Michel tried to weaken the arguments of Harnack against the continuity of Paul with the OT by showing the unity of Paul and Acts with the OT religion. Ulonska<sup>3</sup> does not find this convincing because Michel works from a post-Pauline and dogmatic conception. For Ulonska, the problem of Paul's position regarding the OT still remains.

#### Goppelt (1939)

In the debate concerning continuity of piety, Leonhard Goppelt shows close affinities with Michel by asserting the central connection of the OT with the NT to be that Christ is the "Yes" to the promises of God.<sup>4</sup> The

---

<sup>1</sup>Michel, PSB, p. 152.

<sup>2</sup>Contrary to Ulonska, FAZA, p. 8, who contends for a major and determinative split between the two.

<sup>3</sup>Ulonska, FAZA, p. 8.

<sup>4</sup>Leonhard Goppelt, Typos (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1939), p. 152. Cf. 2 Cor. 1:20.



connection becomes typological. This was also true for Michel<sup>1</sup> though he and Goppelt do not use the term 'type' in the same way. Because the OT illuminates rather than pre-figures the salvation of the new community<sup>2</sup> Paul's works contain not Heilsgeschichte (Michel) but rather Heilslehre (Goppelt).<sup>3</sup> For Goppelt only the Adam/Christ motif is general and comprehensive enough to justify speaking in typological terms. To compare Christ with Moses, a prophet, or David's son is erroneous and peripheral to the Heilslehre distinction.<sup>4</sup> However, Goppelt's assertion that Paul was only interested in the Adam/Christ type does not agree with the data in 1 and 2 Cor. and to say Paul did not have an interest in salvation-history may be cutting the distinction finer than Paul or his readers would have done. Ulonska<sup>5</sup> is correct in asserting that Paul worked from a systematic thought and exegesis rather than an ad hoc typology.

Typology shows not only the way of the new religion over against the old but that the new stands on the very historical ground of the types rather than on a syncretistic myth.<sup>6</sup> Ulonska finds two major problems with this view. First, he questions how this can be

---

<sup>1</sup>Michel, PSB, p. 143.

<sup>2</sup>1 Cor. 10:11.

<sup>3</sup>Goppelt, Typ., pp. 152-54.

<sup>4</sup>Goppelt, Typ., p. 155.

<sup>5</sup>Ulonska, FAZA, p. 10.

<sup>6</sup>Goppelt, Typ., p. 183.

reconciled with Paul's near expectation of the end. Second, he finds it hard to see how the pagan community could have been expected to have such a knowledge of salvation-history from the OT in order to understand this foundation.<sup>1</sup> This criticism is due to Ulonska's basic thesis that Paul used the OT as illustration only, with no intention of typological implications. This study will show that Paul understood his OT quotes as typologically grounded. Ulonska's insistence to the contrary and his use of the term "illustration" are helpful, however, in that the intent of Paul's OT quotes are illustrative. Even if Paul's typological implications would have been missed by many of his readers his basic point would be made. Also, the Corinthian letters give all too painful examples that Paul was often not understood by his readers.

#### Dodd (1952)

C. H. Dodd differed from Michel (and Goppelt as we have seen) in that he saw the OT-NT unity to be in the missionary kerygma. The reason why Paul's letters show no development that Jesus is the Messiah as do the Gospels and Acts is because the communities addressed in his letters did not need convincing.<sup>2</sup> One must realize, however, that such kerygma must be interpreted in its context

---

<sup>1</sup>Ulonska, FAZA, p. 10.      <sup>2</sup>Dodd, AS, p. 18.

and with flexibility. This avoids viewing each quotation with a preconception as to its underlying conceptuality.<sup>1</sup> Dodd,<sup>2</sup> like Goppelt and Michel, asserted that Paul based his theology on a fulfillment schema.

Ellis (1957)

E. E. Ellis, who is statedly in dependence on Dodd and Michel,<sup>3</sup> asserts that Paul used the OT as a salvation-historical source<sup>4</sup> viewed through the implications of the Damascus road experience.<sup>5</sup> While Ellis is a most handy reference to the whole corpus of Pauline quotations from the OT, current research now demands more specific studies of each book, if not each section. Ulonska finds Ellis' work too leveling and general to do justice to the details of the quotations.<sup>6</sup>

Lindars (1961) And Dietzfelbinger (1961)

Barnabas Lindars<sup>7</sup> elaborates the OT-NT usage under three aspects: 1) the use of the OT within the quotation; 2) the use in the OT context; 3) its relationship to the Christian kerygma. One agrees with Lindars that the use of the OT in the NT can clarify the development of

---

<sup>1</sup>Ulonska, FAZA, p. 15.

<sup>2</sup>Dodd, AS, p. 135.

<sup>3</sup>Ellis, PUOT, p. vii.

<sup>4</sup>Ellis, PUOT, p. 135.

<sup>5</sup>Ellis, PUOT, p. 149.

<sup>6</sup>Ulonska, FAZA, p. 18.

<sup>7</sup>Lindars, NTA, pp. 19-20.

the Christian faith<sup>1</sup> and that the OT has an apologetic function in the NT. Lindars is also correct in seeing a major distinction between Christianity and Judaism to be the place of the Law.<sup>2</sup> Though his thesis does not cover nor explain all the OT quotations in the NT, Lindars' work seems to be weakest at its most important point. He asserts that through the debates with the opponents at Galatia Paul learned the early Christian testimonies. During this process of debate Paul gradually came to realize the necessity for overthrowing the Law. Therefore, Paul came to this overthrow after his initial conflicts with Judaism.<sup>3</sup> It is most difficult to understand how Paul could have annuled the Law and its authority simply on the basis of early Christian testimonies. One would conclude from the impressions of Acts and Galatians that Paul had analysed the place of Scripture and Law in Christianity prior to his entry into the major early Christian controversies.<sup>4</sup> While an apologetic function is present in OT quotations, this function is not sufficient to explain the quotations of 1 and 2 Cor.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Lindars, NTA, p. 31.      <sup>2</sup>Lindars, NTA, p. 232.

<sup>3</sup>Lindars, NTA, p. 249. This process of development is also seen in Lindars' assertions that the OT was first used for Christ's resurrection and then was used to prove other areas of His life.

<sup>4</sup>Ulonka, FAZA, p. 19.

<sup>5</sup>Gundry, UOTM, p. 160, writes that:  
 " . . . . strengthening of faith and instruction within the Church were also motives for the use of the OT."

Christian Dietzfelbinger<sup>1</sup> stresses the kerygmatic alignment of OT quotations and asserts that Paul's goal was a conceptualization (Vergegenwartigung) of the OT. Like others, Dietzfelbinger centers this hermeneutical force in the Damascus road experience.<sup>2</sup> This experience enabled Paul to interpret the OT by a promise and fulfillment schema.<sup>3</sup> Unlike Harnack, Dietzfelbinger concludes that the OT became a Christian church-book. Ulonska<sup>4</sup> again insists that this perspective is a later adoption in view of the delay of the parousia. Dietzfelbinger, like Michel, is accused of reading his own piety into Paul's OT in NT use when he claims<sup>5</sup> the unity of God from the OT to the NT on the basis of 2 Cor. 5:19. Ulonska<sup>6</sup> asserts that such a view of the OT places an interpretation back into the OT which makes the OT writers write something of an answer to what was for them

---

Lindars, NTA, *passim*, asserts that LXX elements indicate a late stage of development in Gospel quotations but this would not be the case with the Pauline quotations of 1 and 2 Cor.

<sup>1</sup>Dietzfelbinger, TEH, p. 33.

<sup>2</sup>Dietzfelbinger, TEH, p. 36.

<sup>3</sup>Dietzfelbinger, TEH, p. 34.

<sup>4</sup>Ulonska, FAZA, pp. 22-23. For a recent and stimulating discussion of this subject of the impact of the delay on Christian development see Graydon F. Snyder, "Sayings on the Delay of the End," Biblical Research 20 (1975), pp. 19-35.

<sup>5</sup>Dietzfelbinger, TEH, p. 40.

<sup>6</sup>Ulonska, FAZA, p. 23.

an unknown and later question. Such a link between the Old and New Testaments and therefore the ways of God with men is seen to be outside of the circle of Paul's thought. One feels that the thought finds more problem with Ulonska than with Paul. For Ulonska, the reinterpretation of the OT did not influence continuity.

Braun (1962)

Herbert Braun<sup>1</sup> asserts that the exercise of the NT hermeneutic of applying the OT text is not repeatable today. He writes that NT eschatology violates the OT context by claiming that an event, which for the OT writer was future, for the NT writer is near.<sup>2</sup> Any important continuity of God between the Testaments is denied.<sup>3</sup> For Braun, the OT citations do not conceal any hidden meanings which overarch history, therefore the hermeneutic seen in NT writings distorts the meaning of OT passages. Braun<sup>4</sup> concludes that what binds the two testaments together is the understanding of the relationship of God to man. He sees the Christian message to be but a breath (Hauch) in the OT which is fleshed out in

---

<sup>1</sup>Herbert Braun, "Das Alte Testament Im Neuen Testament," Zeitschrift Für Theologie Und Kirche 59 (1962), p. 30. Braun divides the use of the OT into four categories, p. 16, 1) Paraneuse; 2) Heilsweges; 3) Eschatologie; 4) Christologie.

<sup>2</sup>Braun, ZTK 59:30.

<sup>3</sup>Braun, ZTK 59:30.

<sup>4</sup>Braun, ZTK 59:30-33.

the NT. One wonders, however, if indeed Paul only used and understood the OT as a "Vorform" of the Christian message.<sup>1</sup>

Ulonka (1963)

Herbert Ulonka asks three crucial questions which are pertinent to Paul's hermeneutical and textual use of the OT:<sup>2</sup> 1) Has Paul presupposed the OT as known to his pagan communities? 2) Has he, in the manner of salvation-history, unfolded the OT in terms of the Luke-Acts speeches and in the schema of promise and fulfillment as in Matthew? 3) Has he been so bound to his materials that he can be judged by the presentation of the OT sayings themselves? Ulonka specifically concludes regarding 1 and 2 Cor.:<sup>3</sup> 1) Paul did not treat his hearers as acquainted with the OT and therefore did not treat them as Jewish Christians; 2) The OT was not used in a salvation-historical schema; 3) The OT was used for illustration only and not as an authority for piety. Much of this argument is based on the implications of Paul's near expectation of the Parousia:

Weil für ihm durch die Parusieerwartung die Zukunft qualifiziert ist, bleibe die Vergangenheit - besonders als Instanz zur Legitimierung der Gegenwart ungefragt.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ulonka, FAZA, p. 26.      <sup>2</sup>Ulonka, FAZA, p. 27.

<sup>3</sup>Ulonka, FAZA, pp. 128-29; 150.

<sup>4</sup>Ulonka, FAZA, p. 208.



Paul's words, therefore, take on the timeless (Zeitlosigkeit) quality of "Goldene Worte" which is based in turn on Paul's lostness in the freedom of the Lord.<sup>1</sup>

In 1 and 2 Cor. Ulonska concludes that there is no systematic citation scheme but rather the OT was used as opinion or contemplative material (Anschauungsmaterial) and as a support for thought or warning, but no Frömmigkeitsbild was transmitted.<sup>2</sup> Paul did not set his pre-Christian piety before his hearers:

Ihm geht es noch nicht um Lehre, die aus der Vergangenheit begründet werden soll, sondern um Verkündigung, die immer neu den Menschen treffend und ihn jetzt schon vor den Kyrios stellen will.<sup>3</sup>

To make a distinction between the use of the OT as contemplative material as over against pietistic conceptuality is gratuitous. Ulonska follows Harnack's essential position that Paul did not use the OT for Christian piety but, unlike Harnack, he allows for more than an anti-Jewish apologetic use for the OT. Ulonska's classification of Paul's use of the OT as illustrative or contemplative material is still too narrow a definition to do justice to the 1 and 2 Cor. quotations. Ulonska's thesis

---

<sup>1</sup>Ulonska, FAZA, pp. 207-08.

<sup>2</sup>Ulonska, FAZA, p. 223. In 1 and 2 Thess. Ulonska finds no fulfillment motif as in Acts. In Gal. the OT quotations are used to refute named opponents. In Romans the OT is used as an elaboration of the faith phrased in Jewish Scriptural conceptualities in order to win the Jews.

<sup>3</sup>Ulonska, FAZA, p. 223.

does not reflect a serious consideration of the IF and Jewish hermeneutical methods inherent in Paul and his view of the OT. Also Ulonska presents the case for a more fully developed Gnosticism in Cor. than the data allow, but that subject cannot be treated here.

The material to be presented in 1 and 2 Cor. will show that Paul used the OT in a legalistic<sup>(1 Cor. 5:12; 9:4)</sup> and authoritative way which was immediately concerned with the piety of his readers. The variety of uses of the Exodus motif clearly shows that the moral conceptions of the OT precisely fit the situation in the Corinthian church and were integral to the moral growth and religious standing of its members. This will be seen more clearly in the detailed examinations of the quotations.

### Summary

As can be seen in the foregoing survey, the positions regarding Paul and the OT range from harmony to complete discontinuity. Harnack saw the unity to be based in the piety of Paul. The OT was useful for debate with Judaism but faith was only alive in the kerygma. Harnack imagined a difference between Paul's view of the OT and the community which he founded. Michel agreed with Harnack regarding Paul's piety but saw this view as passed on to his community.

Goppelt confirmed Michel's observations by the example of typology but in doing so he diminished the

salvation-historical conceptuality of Paul.<sup>1</sup> Dodd, Ellis and Lindars do not seem to question the unity at all but in fact widen it to include the first century of Christianity. Ulonska<sup>2</sup> believes this harmonization to be premature to a detailed view of the evidence and brings the same criticism to bear on Dietzfelbinger.

Braun saw the conceptual gulf to be great between the OT and the NT. The OT materials have an original meaning different from that which Paul ascribes to them. On this basis Braun concludes that Paul did not find a unity in the God of the OT and the God of the NT.

### Conclusion

The foregoing survey shows the need and importance of defining levels of conceptuality and legitimacy. In approaching and answering the questions of continuity and piety raised by the quotations in the Corinthian correspondence, four levels of conceptuality will be observed: 1) modern criticism; 2) first century Judaism; 3) Pauline piety; 4) OT context. Ulonska, Braun and Harnack allow their critical conceptualities to be determinative on the level of Pauline piety and fail to distinguish between levels three and four at the interpretive level. That Paul had a view of the OT which is unacceptable in part to modern critical standards is

---

<sup>1</sup>Ulonska, FAZA, p. 26.      <sup>2</sup>Ulonska, FAZA, p. 26.

quite conceivable, as against Ulonska's criticisms,<sup>1</sup> and Paul must be allowed such deviation. To make the accusation that one has interpreted Paul in light of one's own piety can also reflect an equally erroneous eisegesis of the accuser's own critical methodology (modern piety?).

The problem, then, is to examine the Corinthian quotations from the perspective of Paul's own conceptualities, using early Jewish material as comparative data when possible. The OT context formative to the conclusions of this paper is specifically that from the Greek OT of the first century. The insights gained by modern scholarship into the original Hebrew textual tradition were not part of Paul's conceptuality and he must not be expected to conform to them.<sup>2</sup> The possibility that first century Judaism had an inaccurate interpretation of the OT will not be excluded. Judaism, therefore, will not form the control for evaluating Paul's continuity with the OT but rather will be one aspect of his hermeneutical and exegetical conceptuality of which the implications of the Damascus road experience will form the other aspect.

Thus this study of the OT as used in 1 and 2 Cor. will be done on various levels. Each level interacts with and affects the others. The textual area has two vectors:

---

<sup>1</sup>Ulonska, FAZA, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup>As Braun's works seem to assert.

the text which lay before Paul or was in his mind, and the same text as it appears in 1 and 2 Corinthians. The actual text before Paul will have to remain in part a moot point due to lack of evidence. Despite the vast and divergent body of literature on the textual aspects of the OT in NT, conclusions must, however, be drawn. One basis for such conclusions is the assumption that the extant LXX textual evidence is sufficient to form a reliable picture of texts which could have been available to Paul. With this assumption one can then proceed<sup>ed</sup> to identify text types with which Paul agrees. This may lead to a fragmented relationship between Paul and various MSS, therefore, statements implying that Paul used this or that text must be integrated with the current theories about the history of the transmission of the Greek OT. One will then be able to state more accurately what appears to be a variant from the Greek OT due to the influence of interpretive rather than textual phenomena. At this point the textual-comparative study becomes a basis for not only research in the history of the text, but for understanding the first principles of Paul's hermeneutical conceptuality.

On the conceptual level, what one concludes to be actual variants in Paul's writing must then be accounted for. In dealing with interpretive phenomena one must ask what the new text form says and how it compares to the OT sense. This is asked not to force Paul into today's con-

textual paradigms, but to ascertain any development in sense within Paul's historical context. While this context consisted of Jewish, Roman and Greek influences, such comparisons are only of limited value in delving into the motives of the Apostle.

As Paul found the Messiah Jesus to give central meaning to life, so also he found in Him the determinative hermeneutic to the OT Scriptures. It is this identification of Jesus with the Messiah that gives historical and dogmatic specificity to OT texts. Variants in the text or its interpretation need to be studied in order to see what understanding of the Messiah they reflect. Thus the conceptual vector of the use of the OT will be accurately rooted in specific textual data.

These aspects of Paul's exegetical methodology will also be seen in their proper perspective as medium rather than message. Paul's literary forms (epistolary, haggadah, halakah), exegetical methods (implicit or explicit midrash, typology, allegory) and cultural or religious transmissional methods (testimony, text-plots, oral and written) will be seen to be secondary and in subservience to his underlying conceptualities. This conceptuality must be as clearly accounted for as form or methods. The writer is convinced that this must be a descriptive process showing how these aspects have served the guiding hermeneutical conceptuality in the formation of the text as it appears in its final form.

## PART II

### TEXTUAL AND HERMENEUTICAL EVIDENCES

#### INTRODUCTION

This section has a twofold purpose. The first aspect is a presentation of the textual data concerning each quotation in order to see if a particular Pauline variant from the main LXX tradition has other Greek or Hebrew OT support. Such support has been often overlooked in a number of passages with the result that a theological or hermeneutical explanation has been unnecessarily offered instead. The textual data will also provide a cumulative picture of the text-types present in Paul's quotations with a view to placing this picture within the framework of current theories regarding LXX transmission-history by Barthélemy and others. These results will be tabulated and evaluated at the end of this part of the thesis. Their implications will be deliniated in Part Three.

The second aspect of this section is an evaluation of Paul's hermeneutical conceptuality. This is an area which has been subject to much coverage in general but this study will be limited to the specific areas of



1) contextual awareness and fidelity; 2) the related aspect of historical understanding of the OT passages; and 3) the continuity or discontinuity of Paul's conceptions of God and religion which are explicit in his use of the OT. The accumulated hermeneutical data from each quotation will be correlated and final conclusions drawn in Part Three.

The quotations are presented in their OT sequence rather than the order in which they occur throughout 1 and 2 Cor. This is done in order to highlight the textual affinities of the quotations by seeing together all the passages from a particular OT book. One exception to this format concerns the chain or merged quotations which are considered as a unit for contextual and hermeneutical reasons.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The apparatus follows the MSS numberings and notations of the Göttingen LXX and Tischendorf 1872. See Benedict Kraft, Die Zeichen Für Die Wichtigeren Handschriften Des Griechischen Neuen Testaments (Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1955) and Kurt Aland, Kurtzgefasste Liste der Griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter und Co., 1963) for conversion tables to current numberings.

## PENTATEUCH

## GENESIS

GENESIS 2:7, 1 CORINTHIANS 15:45Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
		οὕτως
		καί
	καί	γέγραπται
יְהִי	ἐγένετο	ἐγένετο
	ὁ	ὁ
		πρῶτος
מִדָּאָה	ἄνθρωπος	ἄνθρωπος
		ἄδამ
	εἰς	εἰς
שֶׁנֶפֶשׁ	ψυχὴν	ψυχὴν
הָיָה	ζῶσαν	ζῶσαν

Masoretic Variants

BHK lists no variants for this section.

Septuagintal Variants

ο is omitted by 15, 408-761 18-19-108-119-537-B<sup>S</sup>, 106, 664\*, 343 46<sup>S</sup>: haplogr. of the final ο of ἐγενετο and the article. ο ανθρωπος is omitted by Hieronymus Ezech 11 Is 12, Iren. II 34.4. εἰς is added to ζῶσαν in 135\* by the original scribe. α' agrees with LXX. σ' θ' read: ἐγενετο ο Αδამ ανθρωπος εἰς ψυχην, Philop. 273s.

### New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that d e m<sup>39</sup> vg<sup>cle</sup> and others read οὕτως καὶ while F G f g and others read καθὼς. ἀνθρώπος is read by N A C D E F G L P and others while BK 13 39 63 Ir. int<sup>306</sup> <sup>and others</sup> omit ἀνθρώπος. Ἀδάμ is omitted by 31 and four other MSS.

### Textual

The quotation deviates from the main MSS of the LXX by the inclusion of πρῶτος and ἄδάμ. σ' θ' include ἄδάμ but before, rather than after, ἀνθρώπος, thereby placing ἀνθρώπος in apposition to ἄδάμ. This is evidence for a doublet reading in σ' θ'. Ἀδάμ would be a conformity to the Hebrew אָדָם. Robin Scroggs writes:

In I Cor. xv. 45 Paul has virtually the same introductory formula, [as in 1 Cor. 2:9] followed by a targumic translation of Gen. ii. 7 which varies at least as much from the text (if one allows 45b as part of the targum) as does I Cor. ii. 9 from Isa. lxiv. 4.<sup>1</sup>

It is more probable, however, that vs 45b is a midrashic commentary rather than a targumic allusion. This conforms more appropriately to Paul's general use of the OT. Also it is difficult to see how Scroggs' point of comparison is made between ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται (1 Cor. 2:9 IF) and the IF here, οὕτως καὶ γέγραπται. These are not "virtually the same" IF.

---

<sup>1</sup>Robin Scroggs, "Paul: ΣΟΦΟΣ and ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΣ," New Testament Studies 14 (1967), p. 47, n. 4.

Héring writes that ἄνθρωπος, in 1 Cor. 15:45, should be deleted as a mere duplication of ἄδამ. He feels it was "added to make the texts more like that of the Hebrew Genesis"<sup>1</sup> but offers no support for this. At this point in the investigation it appears that Paul's text was the same as the LXX and that he inserted the adjective and the proper name.

### Contextual

The Old Testament context is the second account of creation in which man is related to God as a product of His personal formation and inspiration. The New Testament context is Paul's discussion of the necessity and varieties of resurrection life.<sup>2</sup> Specifically, the quotation follows Paul's assertion of the order of the natural then the spiritual bodies.

### Hermeneutical

Paul's development of the order of natural then spiritual bodies differs radically from both the develop-

---

<sup>1</sup>Jean Héring, The First Epistle Of Saint Paul To The Corinthians, ET A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock (London: The Epworth Press, 1962), p. 178.

<sup>2</sup>A most important series has been inaugurated by H. C. C. Cavallin, Life After Death (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1974), in which he explores the Jewish background to 1 Cor. 15 and concludes, p. 200, that there was no unified Jewish conception of physical resurrection in early 1st cen. A.D. This only came later in 1st cen. by the Rabbis. Jack H. Wilson, "The Corinthians Who Say There Is No Resurrection Of The Dead," Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 59:99, notes this flux also.

ment of Judaism and Philo; from Philo in that Paul introduces an historical and chronological relationship between the two men Adam and Christ; from Judaism in that Paul gives the restored body a completely spiritual and esoteric quality, totally based by analogy on the new existence made possible by the Messiah Jesus. Paul, while not seeking to provide a new translation, expanded the OT passage both to bring out its original sense and to adapt it to his own conceptuality.<sup>1</sup> The present form of the quotation therefore derives from a hermeneutical, and not a textual, tradition. Though ἄδᾰμ is a transliteration of the Hebrew, ἄνθρωπος would be a suitable translation. σ' and θ' present a doublet in using both ἄδᾰμ and ἄνθρωπος to translate אָדָם. Paul inserted πρῶτος in order to balance with the "second" man, Christ. If ἄδᾰμ<sup>2</sup> was present in Paul's OT text, after the pattern of σ', he has changed its location and given the whole phrase a balance with its second member. This aids in the explanation of and the distinguishing between the first and second Adams and can be seen as the fundamental reason for the insertions.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ellis, PUOT, p. 144; C. K. Barrett, A Commentary On The First Epistle To The Corinthians (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1968), p. 373; David McCalman Turpie, The Old Testament in the New (London: Williams and Norgate, 1868), p. 57; Henry Gough, The New Testament Quotations (London: Walton and Maberly, 1855), p. 302; Swete, IOTG, p. 400, has called this a loose quotation or paraphrase.

<sup>2</sup>Because ἄδᾰμ was also a proper name it serves as a specifying factor as seen both in Paul and σ' θ'.

The Targums and Midrash. In Targum Onkelos the verse is paraphrased "and it became in Adam a Discoursing Spirit."<sup>1</sup> Neofiti reflects a similar concept.<sup>2</sup> In Midrash Rabbah the activities of God teach that man was both terrestrial and celestial as a balance with reference to God's creative work of the "heavens" and "earth." The purpose of this was to maintain peace between the created elements;<sup>3</sup> the underlying concept being that man was the crown of creation and made from its finest substance.<sup>4</sup> With reference to נפש היה, "Judah b. Rabbi said: This teaches that he provided him with a tail, like an animal, but subsequently removed it from him for the sake of his dignity."<sup>5</sup> Another interpretation was that man fell under obligation to keep his soul, נפש, alive and living, היה.<sup>6</sup> This last interpretation is seen again in MR where the living soul made man "a slave indentured to himself, so that if he does not work he does not eat."<sup>7</sup> That Paul

---

<sup>1</sup>J. W. Etheridge, The Targums Of Onkelos And Jonathan Ben Uzziel On The Pentateuch, 2 Vols. (London: Longman, Green, Longman, And Roberts, 1862), Gen. 2:7: וְהָיָה בְּאָדָם לְרוּחַ מְמַלְלָא.

<sup>2</sup>וְהָיָה לְנֶפֶשׁ דְּחַיָּיָא מְמַלְלָא.

<sup>3</sup>H. Freedman, ed., Midrash Rabbah, 10 Vols. (London: Soncino Press, 1939), Genesis, p. 94; Leviticus, pp. 118-19, echoes this concept.

<sup>4</sup>Freedman, MR: Leviticus, p. 111, n. 2.

<sup>5</sup>Freedman, MR: Leviticus, pp. 117-18.

<sup>6</sup>Freedman, MR: Leviticus, p. 118, n. 2.

<sup>7</sup>Freedman, MR: Ecc., p. 67. This interpretation

does not hold this interpretation is seen by the contrast he supplies in asserting that Christ became a life-giving spirit. Adam was a contained living soul with reference to his existence. Christ was a life-generating being. The common ground between Paul and Jewish interpretation at this point is that both interpreted Adam as a historical human figure. Such was not the case with Philo.

Philo. Philo, in speaking of the earthly and ideal Adam,<sup>1</sup> calls the ideal Adam τὸν πρῶτον ἄνθρωπον.<sup>2</sup> Philo's account of the creation of Adam was recorded in the words of the LXX tradition, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν.<sup>3</sup> Philo speaks of this act: "The body,

---

derives two men or inclinations from the two yods in יָצָא ("and He formed"). Scroggs also notes this in LA, p. 86.<sup>1</sup> However, the fact that both Paul and Judaism speak of two men is their only parallel. The same may be said regarding the parallels from MR: Gen., p. 62, concerning the angels having natures from above and animals having earthly natures then man sharing in both elements. Scroggs, LA, p. 88, finds the parallels so striking he is moved to write that "Paul's statements are so similar here that he may very well have had rabbinic theology in mind." The conceptualities of both are radically divergent and therefore the comparison is more interesting than illuminating.

<sup>1</sup>F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker (eds. and ET), Philo I (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1929), p. 106, Op. sec. 134. See also Moffatt, 1 Cor., 263 and Hans Conzelmann, Der erste Brief an die Korinther (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), pp. 338-42, for an excursus on Adam and Primal Man.

<sup>2</sup>Also Colson and Whitaker, Philo, De Op. M. 142, and 140. See R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, Pre-Existence, Wisdom, And The Son Of Man (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1973), pp. 132ff, for the literature regarding the heavenly man.

<sup>3</sup>Colson and Whitaker, Philo, Leg. All. I, sec. 31.



then has been formed out of earth, but the soul is of the upper air, a particle detached from the Deity,"<sup>1</sup> In other places Philo uses πνοὴν ζωῆς for the πνεῦμα ζωῆς of God but the rest of the quotation remains unaltered from the LXX.<sup>2</sup> In an allusion to Gen. 2:7, Philo writes: ἀνθρώπων τῷ πρώτῳ καὶ ἀρχηγέτῃ τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν ἐμφυθεῖσαι πνοὴν ζωῆς τὸν θεόν.<sup>3</sup>

Paul. Paul used the analogy between mankind, as focused in Adam, and Christ, to build his comparison between the resurrection body of Christ and that of resurrected humans. Toy writes:

Paul attaches to this statement the doctrine that the present body was made by God to serve the purpose of the psyche, or animal-intellectual nature; while the raised body, like that of Christ, will be pneumatical or spiritual, in that it will be a fit organ of the pneuma, the higher spiritual nature by which we come to apprehend God and live in communion with him.<sup>4</sup>

With this analogy in view one sees that the quotation is not intended as a proof of vs 44b<sup>5</sup> but to show that what

---

<sup>1</sup>Colson and Whitaker, Philo, Leg. All. III, sec. 161, p. 409.

<sup>2</sup>Colson and Whitaker, Philo, De Plant. 19. Quis Her. 56, and De Somn. sec. 34, where the mind of man is a fragment of deity.

<sup>3</sup>Colson and Whitaker, Philo, De Spec. Leg. IV 123.

<sup>4</sup>Toy, QNT, p. 179. See also H. Riesenfeld, "Le langage parabolique dans les épîtres de saint Paul," Littérature Et Théologie Pauliniennes (Louvain: Desclée De Brouwer, 1960), p. 51, where he contrasts this passage with John 12:24.

<sup>5</sup>Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 386.

was true regarding Adam is also true regarding Christ.

Thus Paul has reversed the Philonic concept of the ideal and historical Adam. This is a result of the fact that, with Paul, the first and second men were linked to a "real temporal distinction."<sup>1</sup> Conzelmann asserts that ". . . das Verhältniss von erstem und zweitem Menschen gegenüber dem gesamten religion-geschichtlichen Vergleichsmaterial umgekehrt ist."<sup>2</sup>

Paul called the earthly Adam ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος and may have been the first to conceive of Christ as the second Adam.<sup>3</sup> Not only are the two men reversed by Paul but the heavenly first man of Philo bears no resemblance to Paul's second man who was a historical individual, Jesus, exalted to divine status.<sup>4</sup> Also, the heavenly man of Philo is not described in Genesis 1 or 2 nor was he

---

<sup>1</sup>Knox, SPCJ, pp. 134-36. A. J. M. Wedderburn, "Philo's 'Heavenly Man'," Novum Testamentum 15 (1973), p. 306 and pp. 309ff for references to the two men in Philo. Wedderburn also finds the heavenly man concept not to be dependent on Gnostic myth but rather on Greek Philosophy, p. 323. See De Op. M. 157, De Sac. A. et C. 76, De Gig. 58 and 60 for Philo's aversion to Greek myths contemporary with him. In fact, Gnosticism is more likely to be dependent on Philo than vice versa, Wedderburn, pp. 325-26.

<sup>2</sup>Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 341.

<sup>3</sup>Davies, PRJ, p. 44. C. F. Burney, The Aramaic Origin Of The Fourth Gospel (Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1922), p. 45, shows that the concept of a second Adam is not found in Judaism until the fifteenth century.

<sup>4</sup>See Matthew Black, "The Pauline Doctrine Of The Second Adam," Scottish Journal of Theology 7 (1954), pp. 171-72.

ever compared with Adam. Philo saw both creation accounts to speak of the same man.<sup>1</sup>

Lala Dey<sup>2</sup> has shown that with Philo there was a great fluidity of terminology regarding titles given to the intermediary world and that these titles were based on an underlying and controlling conceptuality. Therefore Philo was led to identify a figure of the intermediary world, such as the ideal man, on the basis of key-words which triggered his conceptuality rather than blocks of rigid exegetical material. Dey asserts that the two types of men were not based on a distinction between Genesis 1 and 2 but on phrases from one or both. The phrases are not substantival but rather are descriptive of relationships. Therefore, while verbal similarity is interesting, it is the underlying conceptuality that is the real basis for the usage of the passages. At this conceptual level Paul and Philo do not evidence any interdependence.

With reference to Judaism it is interesting to note in MR Gen. Vol. I, p. 17, that the spirit of God which hovered was an allusion to the spirit of Messiah

---

<sup>1</sup>This goes against Wedderburn, NT 15:306, who asserts Philo's two men reflect the order of the biblical narrative. Scroggs, LA, p. 87, n. 3, finds that Paul has nothing in common with Philo at this point.

<sup>2</sup>Lala Kalyan Kumar Dey, The Intermediary World And Patterns Of Perfection In Philo And Hebrews (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975), chapter 1, pp. 7-30.

which would rest upon a man.<sup>1</sup> Also one interpretation concerning "He formed" related to the schools of Shammai and Hillel and to the formation of the body at the resurrection. Hillel argued that at the resurrection the order would be skin and flesh, with sinews and bones last, while Shammai reversed the order.<sup>2</sup> This shows how far Paul's conceptuality was from the contemporary Jewish and Hellenistic views of restoration. For Judaism, the restitution of the perfect earthly state was to crown the future events but for Paul the body itself would be changed into a radically superior body of divine glory.<sup>3</sup>

This relationship between Adam and Christ was typological,<sup>4</sup> being neither an exegetical expedient nor mere speculation. In fact it is the very difference between the two men that forms their relation to the progression which was revealed through typological conceptuality. Amsler<sup>5</sup> concludes that the Adam-Christ typology

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Isa. 11:2.

<sup>2</sup>MR Gen. I, pp. 113-14.

<sup>3</sup>Joachim Jeremias, "Flesh And Blood Cannot Inherit The Kingdom Of God," New Testament Studies 2 (1956), p. 159.

<sup>4</sup>Goppelt, Typ., p. 162. See also Egon Brandenburger, Adam Und Christus (Netherlands: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962), pp. 70-77.

<sup>5</sup>Amsler, ATE, p. 59. Peter Lengersfeld, Adam Und Christus (Essen: Ludgerus-Verlag Hubert Wingen KG, 1965), p. 50. Heinz-Dietrich Wendland, Die Briefe an die Korinther (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954), p. 341, writes: "Hier meldet sich wieder der Gegensatz des Paulus zu dem menschenbilde der Gnostiker zum Worte."

was a reaction to Gnostic speculations at Corinth and that this pattern had a pastoral function only: to clear up misunderstandings and to act as a basis for exhortation. Lengsfeld sees this typology as an object of faith (Glaubensgegenstand) rather than teaching or Creed (Lehre, Bekenntnis).<sup>1</sup> The Adam-Christ analogy, however, was not simply a reaction to the speculations at Corinth (whether they were gnostic or otherwise) as is seen in Paul's use of the analogy in Romans 5. Such analogy did find application to the Corinthian situation. The distinction between Glaubensgegenstand and Lehre is anachronistic. Conzelmann writes that "first" signifies mankind typologically and that "Adam" indicates his character as primal man.<sup>2</sup> However, the term "Adam" in and of itself only specifies the historical figure of Judaism. The addition of Adam in Symmachus and Theodotion cannot be made to intimate a primal man concept at work in those recensions. We conclude that the addition of Adam acts as a proper name in balance with that of Christ. Paul's Adam is not based on the philosophical speculation of the primal man of Hellenism.

Thus vs 45b is Paul's commentary on Gen. 2:7. The last half of vs 45 finds no origin in the OT though

---

<sup>1</sup>Lengsfled, AUC, pp. 63-64.

<sup>2</sup>Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 337.

some take that passage to be part of the quotation.<sup>1</sup> Rather than asserting that vs 45b is a part of the quotation we conclude that it is a pesher-type addition.<sup>2</sup> In first century Palestine the line was not as clearly drawn between text and commentary as Conzelmann and Burney argue.

Summary. While Paul's development of Gen. 2:7 is indeed midrashic the underlying conceptuality breaks with Judaism and Hellenism and indicates that Paul viewed a historical link between the first and last man. He no doubt held that Adam was an historical person and interpreted Gen. 2 quite literally thereby placing the relationship between the two men into history and existence. This is not to deny either an archetypal representative sense inherent in Paul's two men or a prior formulative exegetical tradition.<sup>3</sup> Paul's use of Gen. 2:7, however, stands within the general tradition of Jewish, rather than Philonic, conceptualities by relating the first man to what Judaism believed to be an historical personage. It was Paul's christocentric view of mankind, therefore, that allowed him to insert "first" and "Adam" into the quotation.

---

<sup>1</sup>Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 337, notes "Es muss beachtet werden, dass Paulus V. 45b wie einen Teil des Schriftwortes hinzusetzt." Burney, AOfG, p. 45, concurs.

<sup>2</sup>Ellis, PUOT, pp. 144-45, says it is "perhaps the most notable instance of Pesher quotation in the Pauline literature."

<sup>3</sup>Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 338.

GENESIS 2:24, 1 CORINTHIANS 6:16Textual DisplayMTLXXNT

καί

והיו

ἔσονται

ἔσονται

γάρ

φησὶν

οἱ

οἱ

δύο

δύο

εἰς

εἰς

לשר

σάρκα

σάρκα

תא

μίαν

μίαν

Mt. 19:5; Mk. 10:8; Eph. 5:31: καὶ ἔσονται οἱ

δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.

Masoretic Variants

BHK notes that the LXX, Syriac, Vulgate, and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan insert שניהם after והיו. This would reflect a Hebrew text which varied from the MT.<sup>1</sup>

Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX notes that the οἱ δύο is included in the Samaritan Pentateuch and Targum Neofiti but is absent from Chrysostom IV, (in F. Field, Interpretatio Omn. Epp. Paulinarum) and 305 which agree with Targum Onkelos and

---

<sup>1</sup>Gough, NTQ, p. 302.



the MT. Philo follows the LXX when he quotes Gen. 2:24 in Leg. All. II 14, i. 75 and De Gig. 15, i. 272.

### New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that φησιν is read by  $\aleph$  B C D E F G K L P the Vulgate and others. A Marcion<sup>epiph<sup>355</sup></sup> Tertullian<sup>pud<sup>16</sup></sup> Cyprian <sup>323</sup> and Ambrose passim omit φησιν.

### Textual

The quotation, apart from the IF, γὰρ φησίν, equals the text of the LXX.

### Contextual

Genesis 2:24 is an explanation inserted into the Hebrew regarding the propriety and reason for marriage and is to be attributed either to Adam or Moses.<sup>1</sup> The complete unity achieved in the creation of one flesh from two individuals is described.

In Corinthians the sexual aspect is in the background as one could hardly suspect that Paul was asking, in vs. 16, if the readers knew the physiology involved in sexual union. Paul stressed the unity of emotion and spirit which was achieved in the sexual act. A comparison was drawn of the union of the believer with Christ to show, not the impossibility of being at the same time one with Christ and one with a πορνή, but to show its utter

---

<sup>1</sup>Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 149.

incompatibility.<sup>1</sup> By presenting this illustration of unity, the Apostle was trying to convey clearly the absolute contradiction involved. The mild adversative δέ heightens this contrast by noting the even more thoroughgoing unity of man with Christ.<sup>2</sup> Mt. 19:5 reproduces the vs as in 1 Cor. 6:16 and emphasizes unity in relation to the idea of divorce. Mt. 19:6 says the man and wife are σὰρξ μία. The Mk. 10:8 context parallels Mt. 19:6. In Eph. 5:31, regarding Christ and the Church, Paul quotes Gen. 2:24 without the IF after ὅτι μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ. He called this concept a mystery of Christ and the Church and saw this relationship of unity to be a figure (type?) of the nurture and care of Christ for His church. The bride metaphor underlies Paul's thought and his exposition highlighted one implication of that figure.

Paul quotes a larger portion of Gen. 2 in Eph. 5:31 where προσκολληθήσεται precedes the portion of Gen. 2:24 common to both Eph. and 1 Cor. In 1 Cor. 6:16-17 Paul used κολλάω. Mt. 19:5, quoting Gen. 2:24 uses κολληθήσεται. Sampley<sup>3</sup> suggests that Paul got this concept from Sirach 19:2 where κολλάω is similarly used. It is more convincing to conclude that the word occurs because it was known to Paul in the LXX context, as Eph. 5:31 shows (granting Pauline authorship of Eph.).

---

<sup>1</sup>Wendland, Kor., p. 47.      <sup>2</sup>vs 17.

<sup>3</sup>J. Paul Sampley, And The Two Shall Become One Flesh (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1971), p. 79.

### Hermeneutical

T. A. Burkill<sup>1</sup> judges that Paul "carries his analogical argument beyond the bounds of rational experience" when he makes a "sudden switch from the notion of corporal or carnal henosis to that of merging into one spirit (pneuma).<sup>2</sup> This OT sense of essential unity was adopted by Paul in placing the quotation into its new setting. It is not clear whether  $\phi\eta\sigma\iota\nu$  refers to God<sup>2</sup> or the Scripture. Though this is essentially a distinction without a difference. Gen. 2:24 is treated as an utterance of God in Mt. 19:5.

In other literature the verse is variously interpreted. In MR Gen., pp. 131, 146, the verse is used in its plain literal sense. Neofiti I and Onkelos also adhere closely to the original sense. Philo used the passage to speak of a carnal man leaving the Father who is God and Mother, who is God's excellence and wisdom, to cling to his sense perceptions.<sup>3</sup> As such, both Philo and

---

<sup>1</sup>T. A. Burkill, "Two into One: The Notion of Carnal Union in Mark 10:8; 1 Cor. 6:16; Eph. 5:31," Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 62 (1971), p. 120.

<sup>2</sup>Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer, A Critical And Exegetical Commentary On The First Epistle Of St. Paul To The Corinthians (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911), p. 126, sees God as the subject. (See Ro. 9:15 and 2 Cor. 6:2). J. B. Lightfoot, Notes On Epistles Of St. Paul (London: Macmillan and Co., 1895), p. 217, writes that it is inconclusive but is probably impersonal.

<sup>3</sup>Leg. All II 49, p. 254. A similar idea is found in De Gig. 65, p. 478, where men are seen turning from

Paul agree that the concept of "one flesh" is a good vehicle for communicating the idea of a spiritual unity though their methods and conclusions are quite divergent.

The "they" of ἑσονται becomes, by application, the Corinthian and his πορνή. Contextually this is a startling contrast to the originally pure and serene setting in the Garden concerning Adam and Eve's initial union. This broadening of the verb's subjects shows that Paul had drawn a <sup>principle from</sup> Gen. 2:24 and then applied it to a specific situation. The unity implied by the union with a prostitute was greater than the Corinthians believed. As prostitution was so commonplace they possibly thought that there was little more than a casual and superficial personal implication in such activity. Paul used the quotation to demonstrate that in God's judgment such acts point to a vital and significant union, so vital as to be only appropriate within the marriage bond. The quotation serves to illustrate why a man is one flesh with a prostitute.

It is noteworthy that Paul used σῶμα just prior to the quotation and yet allowed the quoted σάρκα to remain. In doing so Paul gave sarx a greater specificity than in Genesis.<sup>1</sup> Barrett sees a progression from "body" to

---

reason to the fleshly nature.

<sup>1</sup>Héring, 1 Cor., p. 46. F. F. Bruce, 1 and 2 Corinthians (London: Oliphants, 1971), p. 64, calls this a variation on the "one flesh" concept of Gen. 2.

"flesh" to "spirit" and holds that the use of Gen. 2:24 formed the bridge between body and spirit.<sup>1</sup> It is doubtful that Paul made a trichotomous distinction between σὰρξ and σῶμα (and πνεῦμα) at this point<sup>2</sup> but rather concentrated on the physical body in general thereby allowing for the ostensibly synonymous use of both terms.

Paul's use of Gen. 2:24 is consistent with its use elsewhere within the first century Christian tradition. Paul presented an argument from the lesser to the greater by implying that if the unity achieved on a human level of marriage is not intended to be broken but rather is permanent, how much more the spiritual unity achieved between the believer and His Lord. While the context is innovative, the use of the passage maintains its historical and primary sense. The use of the passage in an ethical argument also shows a continuity of piety and deity from the OT.

---

<sup>1</sup>Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 149.

<sup>2</sup>Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 127. Robert H. Gundry, Sōma In Biblical Theology With Emphasis On Pauline Anthropology (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), pp. 51-80, puts forth a case for seeing soma to refer to the physical body in 1 Cor. 6:12-20, indeed throughout the entire NT. Conzelmann, 1 Kor., pp. 134-35, notes that σὰρξ is used in a neutral anthropological manner. But it is clearly the physical body which is in view. See also Sampley, TOF, p. 78.

## EXODUS

EXODUS 16:18, 2 CORINTHIANS 8:15Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
		καθώς
		γέγραπται
כָּלִי	οὐκ	
קִיטָה	ἐπλεόνασεν	
	ὁ	ὁ
	τό	τό
הַרְבֵּה	πολύ	πολύ
		οὐκ
		ἐπλεόνασεν
טִימְמַה	καί	καί
	ὁ	ὁ
	τό	τό
	ἐλαττον	ὀλίγον
כִּל	οὐκ	οὐκ
רִסְהָה	ἡλαττόνησεν	ἡλαττόνησεν

Masoretic Variants

BHK lists no variants for this section.

Septuagintal Variants

B-M notes that f omits the first οὐκ-ελαττον. Οὐκ ἐπλεόνασεν comes after πολυ in n Armenian Boharic (begins with και). The first o is read  $\hat{\omega}$  by m q Eth. The

second ο το is omitted in a codex of Philo. The second ο is read <sup>ω</sup> by m q Eth. Ελαττον is read ελασσον by b x; ολιγον by A<sup>a</sup> Philo and Paul. The second ουκ is preceded by και in m. n reads ελαττονευσεν for ηλαττονησεν and Philo reads ελαττωσε. α' and θ' follow the LXX but σ' reads και ουχ ευρον περισσον ο το πλεον ουδε ο το ολιγον ηλαττονησε. Onkelos reads:

. . . and he who had much had not more, and he who had little had not less; every man according to the mouth of his eating they gathered.<sup>1</sup>

#### New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that F and G read πολλυ. ο sec: F G al fere <sup>15</sup> (5 ap Scri) om . . . 26\* 38.48.72 al aliq bis <sup>ω</sup> for ο, item tol cui multum et cui modicum.

#### Textual

In the first part of the quotation, Paul reads ουκ επλεονασεν after ο το πολυ.<sup>2</sup> This reading has wide-spread geographical support, therefore the possibility that Paul witnesses to an early Palestinian Greek text should be considered. There is no need to posit a non-MT Hebrew basis because, though the chiasmus of the Hebrew and LXX is altered in Paul's version, n. Arm. and Boh., this is most likely a translational preference. In the last half of the quotation Paul reads ολιγον for ελαττον.<sup>3</sup> This

<sup>1</sup>Etheridge, TOJ.

<sup>2</sup>As do n Arm. and Boh.

<sup>3</sup>A<sup>a</sup> Philo and σ'.



quotation includes all the words in the LXX of Ex. 16:18.

### Contextual

The OT context concerns the gift of manna which was given to the Israelites in the early part of their exodus from Egypt. The nation was told to gather an omer of the food for each person<sup>1</sup> with the result that some heads of households gathered more, some less.<sup>2</sup> The verse under consideration expresses the fact that when what was gathered was measured all needs were met with neither excess nor lack as each man had gathered "according to his eating."

Paul, in 2 Cor. 8, wrote with regard to the pending offering for the Jerusalem church. In 2 Cor. 8:12 Paul stressed the aspects of freewill and practicality in the giving and continued in vss 13-14 to explain the flow of equality necessary between Christian communities. The church who<sup>ick</sup> had the ability was obligated to see its way clear to share its abundance "that there may be equality."<sup>3</sup> The quotation is inserted to illustrate or substantiate this point.

### Hermeneutical

The quotation has only minor variations from the LXX and has been classed as free.<sup>4</sup> However MS evidence

---

<sup>1</sup>Ex. 16:16.      <sup>2</sup>Ex. 16:17.      <sup>3</sup>2 Cor. 8:14.

<sup>4</sup>For example, Gough, NTQ, p. 306.

has been noted with a wide geographical spread which supports Paul's word order, What has been termed "free" may be, in reality, a close adherence to a first century text-type. Bonsirven writes that ὀλίγον used for ἔλαττον is an example of the replacement of a word by its equivalent,<sup>1</sup> though he also overlooks the textual basis as has been already noted. It would appear that Paul's text read ὀλίγον.

This verse is used by Philo<sup>2</sup> in referring to "the heavenly food of the soul, wisdom" which is the spiritual meaning of manna. This food is given "to all who will use it in equal portions by the divine Word, careful above all things to maintain equality."<sup>3</sup> Hanson writes:

Thus Philo's treatment could be said to have prepared the way for Paul's in the sense that it transfers the whole incident into the sphere of spiritual transactions, and that it whitewashes the Israelites and represents the affair as a matter of God giving rather than Israel procuring.<sup>4</sup>

It seems likely, however, that, not Philo, but the OT passage itself first and originally demonstrated a spiritual lesson of God's provision; that all needs were met

---

<sup>1</sup>Bonsirven, EREP, p. 333. See also Turpie, OTN, p. 21.

<sup>2</sup>Colson and Whitaker, Philo IV, p. 378, Quid Her. 191.

<sup>3</sup>Colson and Whitaker, Philo IV, p. 379.

<sup>4</sup>Hanson, SPTT, p. 175.

both by God's provision and man's gathering.<sup>1</sup> The Exodus context quite clearly points out man's responsibility to gather but only according to his daily needs. The point was a day-to-day reliance upon the sovereign provisions of Yahweh. Philo's spiritualization of the passage, making manna wisdom, the spiritual food of the soul, takes the Exodus passage into quite another direction than would be useful to Paul. The Apostle applied the verse to explicitly physical and tangible matters of support and provision for the daily maintenance of the saints.

Several commentators conclude that Paul has ignored, by varying degrees, the historical context of the OT quotation. Edgar calls this a "flagrant misuse of a verse" and writes that "in the original passage this referred to the manna in the wilderness; there was no suggestion of sharing . . . . Paul paid no attention at all to the context."<sup>2</sup> This problem with the context arises more from a preconception of what kind of quota-

---

<sup>1</sup>Martin Noth, Das Zweite Buch Mose (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959), p. 108, "Gott gibt immer, das soll Israel daraus lernen, das für den augenblicklichen Bedarf Erforderliche, das 'tägliche Brot,' nicht mehr und nicht weniger (v. 17.18)." See also J. Philip Hyatt, Commentary On Exodus (London: Oliphants, 1971), p. 177, and Brevard S. Childs, Exodus (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1974), p. 289, for the theological thrust of the original passage.

<sup>2</sup>S. L. Edgar, "Respect For Context In Quotations From The Old Testament," New Testament Studies 9 (1962-63), pp. 56-67. Allan Menzies, The Second Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Corinthians (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1912), p. 62, also points out the absence of giving or receiving in the Exodus story.

tion was demanded by Paul's context rather than a desire to let the quotation speak for itself and then to seek to understand its place in the Epistle.

While most commentators find the human element of sharing absent they correctly evaluate the quotation's stress on equality. This is exactly central to Paul's use of the passage.<sup>1</sup> Plummer<sup>2</sup> elaborates this equality as being not "the result of mutual give and take, which is a voluntary process, but that which is the result of the same measure being imposed on all, which is not voluntary." But it is what constitutes this formal imposition of equality which is at the foundation of Paul's selection of this passage. Theologically Paul linked the actions of God among Israel with His actions among the Church. While human responsibility in giving was ultimately Paul's message he used the quotation to provide a divine pattern upon which he could build his exhortations. Therefore to criticise Paul's regard for context on the basis of a lack of sharing in the OT passage is to miss the real reason for Paul's use of it. This theology was organic in the motivation of the Corinthians to give in accordance with the generosity which God showed in

---

<sup>1</sup>Menzies, 2 Cor., p. 62.

<sup>2</sup>Alfred Plummer, A Critical And Exegetical Commentary On The Second Epistle Of St. Paul To The Corinthians (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1915), p. 245.

Christ.<sup>1</sup> Thus the quotation is a theologically centered typological figure<sup>2</sup> of the way God's character and acts, which form a consistent link from Israel to the Church, should be expressed through the responsible acts of the community. It is an example, "une révélation symbolique,"<sup>3</sup> of God's desire and provision for equality, not only for the nation in the wilderness but for the new Israel, the Church. Thus Paul displays a sense of continuity of deity from the OT and makes application of the quotation on the basis of its plain historical context.

---

<sup>1</sup>Hanson, SPTT, p. 177, notes the use of περίσσεια, πτωχεία, ἐπερίσσευσέν, πλοῦτος, χάριν; see 1 Cor. 10:1-11.

<sup>2</sup>Bonsirven, EREP, p. 329.

<sup>3</sup>E.-B. Allo, Seconde Épître Aux Corinthiens (Paris: J. Gabalda et C<sup>ie</sup>, 1956), p. 220.

EXODUS 32:6, 1 CORINTHIANS 10:7Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
	καί	ὥπερ
		γέγραπται
ישי	ἐκάθισεν	ἐκάθισεν
	ὁ	ὁ
עגה	λαός	λαός
לכל	φαγεῖν	φαγεῖν
	καί	καί
ישי	πיעῖν	πεῖν
	καί	καί
ישי	ἀνέστησαν	ἀνέστησαν
לכל	παίζειν	παίζειν

Masoretic Variants

BHK offers no variants for this section.

Septuagintal Variants

Swete notes that the original scribe of B corrected *πιειν* to *πειν*.<sup>1</sup> In A *πιειν* is the correction of the second scribe as confirmed by the third. Brooke-McLean note that Justin reads *εφαγε και επειν ο λαος και*

---

<sup>1</sup>James Hope Moulton and Wilbert Francis Howard, *A Grammar Of New Testament Greek II* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1929), p. 89, notes that this is an example of the normal *Koinē* tendency to contract two i-sounds into one. See also Hans Conzelmann, *1 Kor.*, p. 193, n. 7.

ανεστη του παιζειν.

### New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that πειν is read by  $\aleph$  (πιν) B\* D\* F G while A B<sup>3</sup> C D<sup>C</sup> E K L P and <sup>apparently all</sup> others read πειν.

### Textual

Other than the orthographical variations surrounding πεῖν, Paul's quotation is an exact quotation from the Greek OT.

### Contextual

The OT context is Israel's idolatry which occurred during Moses' delay on Mt. Sinai. The golden calf had been constructed and Ex. 32:6 describes the activities of Israel in her worship of it.

The NT context continues Paul's illustrative discourse on the example of Israel in the wilderness. The phrases ὑπο τὴν νεφέλην and διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης of 1 Cor. 10:1 have become symbols, or types, of the participation in, hence identification with, the great redemption of Israel from Egypt. This identification is heightened by the use of ἐβαπτίσαντο and ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ.<sup>1</sup> The mention of spiritual food and drink also heightens the sense of Israel's participation in the privileges of their salvation. Paul has clearly drawn a comparison between Israel

---

<sup>1</sup>1 Cor. 10:2. The prepositions exhibit an instrumental of means.



and the Christian community by his reference to baptism and eating which pictures the elements of the Lord's supper. Paul has even emphasized this later aspect by insisting that the meat and drink was directly from the spiritual presence of the Messiah. He draws this identification in detail in 1 Cor. 10:14-22. In specifying the types<sup>1</sup> of Israel which should be avoided by the Corinthians, Paul used the quotation descriptive of idolatry. Idolatry is the second in a list of five prohibited actions.<sup>2</sup>

### Hermeneutical

The quotation illustrates the actions of a certain group within the nation<sup>3</sup> but it is of interest that Paul felt the need to illustrate this point with a quotation when the other four (lust, immorality, tempting Yahweh, murmuring) are described in his own words. The quotation certainly shows the pleasures of Israel in their sin<sup>4</sup> as well as the format of their sin: eating and immoral

---

<sup>1</sup>τύποι, 1 Cor. 10:6.

<sup>2</sup>lust, vs 6; idolatry, vs 7; immorality, vs 8; tempting the Lord, vs 9; murmuring, vs 10.

<sup>3</sup>τινες αὐτῶν, 1 Cor. 10:7.

<sup>4</sup>Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 223. Joost Smit Sibinga, The Old Testament Text of Justin Martyr (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), p. 138, notes that Dt. 32:15 and Ex. 32:6 are combined in Justin and Tertullian which he sees as evidence for the presence of a testimony collection especially in view of the old variant in Justin.

sport.<sup>1</sup> This quotation is therefore an easily remembered and concise description of idolatrous acts and was included as an apt description of the idol feasts in Corinth.<sup>2</sup>

According to Bonsirven, the texts cited in 1 Cor. 10:7-10 are not cited for a demonstration or illustration, but for enunciating a part of Paul's argument and do not display any exegetical method.<sup>3</sup> This use of the OT by Paul does display evidence of his hermeneutical methodology, however. He viewed the events of Israel as historical realities which then became examples for his readers. The use of ἐγενήθησαν of 1 Cor. 10:6 needs to be compared with τυπικῶς συνέβαινεν of 1 Cor. 10:11. In the first instance Paul is saying that the events of the Exodus became (culminative aorist) types. This process was evidently a result of Paul's hermeneutical pro-

---

<sup>1</sup>James Moffatt, The First Epistle Of Paul To The Corinthians (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938), p. 131, and Robertson, 1 Cor., pp. 203-4. Midrash Rabbah, ed. H. Freedman, on Numbers, p. 103, refers to that "unnameable act" of calf worship. On p. 283 of Numbers the Midrash identifies אֵל with a sitting expressly for eating and drinking. In Exodus Rabbah, p. 1, it is noted that mezahek is "always used of idolatry" as in Ex. 32:6. See also Exodus Rabbah, p. 478 and Gen. Rabbah, p. 470. See also Gen. 26:8; 39:17 for lešahēq with sexual implications; William F. Orr, and James Arthur Walther, 1 Corinthians (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1976), p. 246.

<sup>2</sup>F. F. Bruce, 1 & 2 Cor., p. 92. Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 193, n. 33, notes the parallelism of the eating and playing with idolatry and immorality.

<sup>3</sup>Bonsirven, EREP, pp. 320-21.

cess which viewed the OT as having direct implications for the present. At this point such implications would be at home in Judaism as well as in Christianity. The adverbial τυπικῶς of 1 Cor. 10:11 draws the relationship of the OT to the present even more directly. The mode of the happening of the events was typological; that is, infused with a meaning for Paul's present. This is one reason why they were recorded.<sup>1</sup> The hermeneutical methodology displayed here can only be loosely termed "typological." There is no sense of fulfillment in Paul's use of the quotation. The link with Paul's present was not so much the event of Ex. 32 but the attitude of God toward that event. Because the attitude of God (ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τῷ πλείοσιν αὐτῶν εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεός κτλ. 1 Cor. 10:5) was the link with the present situation in Corinth, the translations for τύποι (1 Cor. 10:6) and τυπικῶς (1 Cor. 10:11) should be "examples" and "as examples"<sup>2</sup> rather than "types" and "typologically." Paul did not point to a prophetic antitype but used the OT event as warning or parenesis [νουθεσίαν (1 Cor. 10:11)] based on the continuing and consistent attitude of God toward idolatry. God's principles of conduct as implied in the use of the five categories then became applicable to the Christians in Corinth.

---

<sup>1</sup>ἔγγραφη, 1 Cor. 10:11.

<sup>2</sup>This is consistent with 1 Thess. 1:7; 1 Tim. 4:12; 1 Pet. 5:3.

Paul presented a finely tuned ethical demand leading to the conclusion of vs 14.<sup>1</sup> Idolatry had not totally left his mind since 1 Cor. 8:1 and therefore the quotation must be seen as another support for Paul's anti-idolatry argument. The quotation itself proves only that some of the Israelites were idolaters, not that they were punished for it. The next verse<sup>2</sup> speaks of punishment. The quotation is designed to place idolatry in the context of judgment within the community of the redeemed. This process, as transferred to the Corinthian church, shows the ubiquitous Pauline conceptuality of the Church as the New Israel. Paul used the vivid historical example of the events at Sinai to parallel the events in Corinth. The cry of "all things are lawful"<sup>3</sup> for the redeemed had prompted Paul to counter with distinctions inherent within ancient redeemed Israel. This is a direct, historical application of an OT event to a NT ethical problem and shows a continuity of deity and piety.

---

<sup>1</sup>Διόπερ, ἀγαπητοί μου, φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλο-  
λατρίας.

<sup>2</sup>1 Cor. 10:8.

<sup>3</sup>1 Cor. 10:5.

EXODUS 34:34, 2 CORINTHIANS 3:16Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
	ἡνίκα	ἡνίκα
	δ' ἄν	δέ ἐαν
וּבֹא	εἰσεπορεύετο	ἐπιστρέψῃ
מֹשֶׁה	μωσῆς	
לִפְנֵי	ἐναντι	πρός
יְהוָה	κυρίου	κύριον
לְדַבֵּר	λαλεῖν	
וְהָא	αὐτῷ	
יְסִיר	περιηρεῖτο	περιαιρεῖται
	τό	τό
הַמַּסְתֵּר-תָּא	κάλυμμα	κάλυμμα
עַד	ἕως	
	τοῦ	
וְיִסָּח	ἐκπορεύεσθαι	

Masoretic Variants

BHK lists no variants for this section.

Septuagintal Variants

B-M note that q reads ηνίκα αν and q\* reads ηνιδαν. Δε is read for δ αν by b c w Chr. Επορεύετο is read by f x. B k m n p read μωσης while A F M rell read μωσσης and Chr. omits it. Εναντι κυριου bis scr p\*. Εναντιον is read by a b Chr. Cyr.; c reads ενωπιον. Chr.

places του before κυριου. Δαλων is read by n and several MSS of Cyr. d has αυτο instead of αυτω, x has αυτον, and Chr. omits the pronoun. f (p<sup>ex</sup> corr fa) reads περιειρητω. a n r Chr. Cyr. read περιηρει and x has περιερρει. The article before καλυμμα is omitted by m b z. o has καταλυμμα. A reads ου for του. n has εισπορευεσθαι. k and m have εξελθειν αυτον and c Chr. add αυτον to εκπορευεσθαι.

### New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that κ\* A and 17 read ηνικα δε εαν. Or.<sup>1,686</sup> reads ηνικα γαρ εαν and <sup>3,498</sup> εαν γαρ Alibi tantum εαν and <sup>3,459</sup> ηνικα αν. c Mac.<sup>7,217</sup> Dam. read ηνικα δε. κ<sup>C</sup> B D E F G K L P<sup>alpler</sup> Chr.<sup>567</sup> Thdrt. ad h.l. and <sup>1,173</sup> read ηνικα δ αν. Did.<sup>229</sup> Nyss.<sup>1,652</sup> Bas.<sup>3,44</sup> Thdrt <sup>1,442</sup> read οταν δε.

### Textual

Paul has omitted the proper name μωσῆς as well as the purpose (λαλεῖν αὐτῷ) of Moses' going into the presence of the Lord. With Paul δ' αν has become δέ εαν.

The εαν of the quotation may be a correction of literary morphology.<sup>1</sup> Εἰσεπορεύετο is changed to ἐπιστρέψη. Ἐναντι becomes πρὸς. The tense of περιαιρέω is changed from the imperfect to the present. The textual evidence at this point

---

<sup>1</sup>Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 102.

suggests that the Pauline form was hermeneutically, rather than textually, determined.

### Contextual

The OT context is that of Moses' second appearance with the tablets of the Law. His face shone in such a glorious manner that the people were afraid to come near him. They were recalled, however, and stood before Moses while he spoke the words of the covenant. After these words Moses placed the veil over his face and removed his covering only when he went before the Lord in the tabernacle. He replaced the veil whenever he spoke the words of the Law to the people.

Paul, in 2 Cor. 3, demonstrated the superiority of the New Covenant over the Old.<sup>1</sup> This is part of a long apology for the apostolic ministry.<sup>2</sup> Because of this superiority the Apostle is able to use great boldness in his speech.<sup>3</sup> The Law's inaugural glory was seen on Moses' shining face when he became the recipient and transmitter of the revelation. His glory was temporary

---

<sup>1</sup>McNamara, NPTP, p. 169. 2 Cor. 3:7-8. We concur with J.-F. Collange, Enigmes De La Deuxieme Epitre De Paul Aux Corinthiens (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1972), p. 85, who has shown that there is no break between 2 Cor. 3:11 and 12 and that vss 12-16 are not a gloss from a pre-Pauline document. Vs 9 demonstrates the use of qal vahomer.

<sup>2</sup>Paul Démann, "Moïse Et La Loi Dans La Pensée De Saint Paul," from Moïse, L'Homme De L'Alliance, Cahiers Sioniens 2-3-4 (1954), p. 194.

<sup>3</sup>2 Cor. 3:12.



but nonetheless from Yahweh. A contrast is thus drawn between the actions of Moses, which were veiled, and those of Paul which were done in unhindered reflection of the glory of the Lord.<sup>1</sup>

Paul's double use of τὸ καταργούμενον<sup>2</sup> and τοῦ καταργουμένου<sup>3</sup> supports the concept that that which was "passing away" was not only the reflection of glory on Moses' face but the whole content and context of the Law. For Paul the law was not the last word of God to his nation but acted as a temporary step in God's economy.<sup>4</sup> Moses' intention was to keep Israel from becoming spell-bound, ἀτενίσαι,<sup>5</sup> by the glory of the Law to the detri-

---

<sup>1</sup>2 Cor. 3:18.

<sup>2</sup>The "passing away" element has shifted from the glory on Moses' face to what it heralded: the Law itself, or as Paul phrases it in vs 9, ἡ διακονία τῆς κατακρίσεως. 2 Cor. 3:11, τὸ καταργούμενον . . . .

<sup>3</sup>2 Cor. 3:13.

<sup>4</sup>Amsler, ATE, p. 50.

<sup>5</sup>2 Cor. 3:13. Collange rightly notes that this term is the key to Paul's interpretation, E2Cor., p. 96. See James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1930), p. 89, for the term's intensive quality. It is interesting to note that κατανοῆσαι translates נִרְאָה in Ex. 19:21 where a too eager desire to see the glory of God on Sinai would have resulted in death. No wonder the Israelites both feared the similar glory on Moses' face but would most likely also have had a strong curiosity to see it. Εἶδεν translates נִרְאָה in Ex. 34:30 and ἔιδον for נִרְאָה in Ex. 34:35. Also note the key-word καθάπερ, (2 Cor. 3:13) in Paul's analogy. 2 Cor. 3:14-15 sustains the analogy of the public reading of the Law by Moses and in Paul's day. C. J. A. Hickling, "The Sequence Of Thought In II Corinthians, Chapter Three," New Testament Studies 21 (1975), p. 390, sees ἀτενίσαι as an "expansive exegesis of Exodus" rather than a motive for Moses putting on the veil. But this

ment of their appreciation of the Person of Yahweh. The veil had then become the symbol for the reason why Israel rejected Christ. They were veiled from seeing His eternal glory but Paul does not elaborate on why or how they are blinded. At the end of this midrash the NT believers themselves are transformed by the vision of Christ. The parallel was between Moses and his glory and the minister and his glory.<sup>1</sup>

### Hermeneutical

This quotation is the climax of Paul's midrashic<sup>2</sup> exposition of Ex. 34 and serves as a support for the contrast between the Law and the ministry of the apostle.<sup>3</sup>

Origin. One initial problem concerns the origin of this midrash. Georgi<sup>4</sup> theorizes that Paul turned a

---

ignores the grammatical thrust of the πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀτενίσαι of 2 Cor. 3:13.

<sup>1</sup>Demann, CS 2-3-4:195.

<sup>2</sup>Doeve, JHSG, p. 98. J. D. G. Dunn, "2 Corinthians III. 13 - The Lord Is The Spirit," Journal of Theological Studies n.s. 21 (1970), p. 312. Albrecht Oepke, "καλυμμα," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament III (1965), p. 560, also adds "allegorical." But Paul's radical hermeneutical and conceptual results have not altered his Jewish methodology. He constructs the midrash in the manner of Jewish methods, Le Déaut, Bib. 50:408.

<sup>3</sup>Dunn, JTS 21:312.

<sup>4</sup>Dieter Georgi, Die Gegner Des Paulus In 2. Korintherbrief (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchen Verlag, 1964). Also Siegfried Schulz, "Die Decke Des Moses Untersuchungen Zu Einer Vorpaulinischen Überlieferung In II Cor 3:7-18," Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 49 (1958).

midrash which had been composed by Paul's enemies around on them. This supposed allusive and sarcastic method of argumentation is doubtful. Were Paul's readers so subtle and would Paul risk another misunderstanding just to be clever and sarcastic?<sup>1</sup>

Language. A second problem concerns the language from which Paul drew the quotation. Doeve remarks that it is doubtful if Paul used the LXX here. He bases this opinion on the supposition that Paul had 1) knowingly left out the end of the OT verse because it was of no use to his purpose and 2) that the present tense of the Hebrew (יִסֵּר Hiph. impf. 3 ms.) would be significant to a rabbi like Paul.<sup>2</sup> Doeve holds that Paul has used the principle of the deeper sense of Scripture because he has interpreted the verse in a spiritual manner. Because אָל and וְאֵל alternate in being translated ἐπιστρέφειν (but only in LXX 1 Kings 22:27-28) this offers grounds for substitution elsewhere.<sup>3</sup> There is much in Doeve's remarks.

---

<sup>1</sup>Collange, E2Cor., p. 68, and C. J. A. Hickling, "Is The Second Epistle To The Corinthians A Source For Early Church History?," Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 66 (1975), do not think so. Morna D. Hooker, "The Johanne Prologue And The Messianic Secret," New Testament Studies 21 (1975), p. 57, relates 2 Cor. 3:1-4:6 to John's prologue regarding the Messianic secret. Both refer to the hiding of God's glory and the completion of the Old Covenant in Christ. (See also Ro. 16:25f; Col. 1:25,2f; Eph. 3:3ff.)

<sup>2</sup>Doeve, JHSG, p. 99.

<sup>3</sup>Georg Bertram, "στρέφω," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament VII (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1971), pp. 714-29. Bertram's n. 33

In addition it must be noted that the allusive<sup>1</sup> quality of the passage is supported by the absence of an IF. There is, however, enough correspondence with the LXX here,<sup>2</sup> as in the vast majority of Paul's OT quotations, to support Paul's use of the Greek rather than Hebrew OT.

Early Jewish Interpretation. Paul's substitution of ἐπιστρέψῃ for εἰσεπορεύετο is the hermeneutical crux of this passage. While this substitution may be conjectured as a textual<sup>3</sup> rather than a hermeneutical phenomenon its particular causes are more adequately treated as part of the hermeneutical considerations. Several early Jewish works use this OT passage but do not show Paul's conceptuality regarding repentance.

---

on p. 728 should be corrected from 3 Βασ. 22:17 to 22:27. Vs 17 reads ἀναστρέψτω.

<sup>1</sup>Allo, 2 Cor., p. 92, writes that this verse in Cor. is not "une citation biblique expresse" but is more like an adaptation to the present subject of Ex. 34:34 which colors the syntax and terminology of the quotation. This is most important to bear in mind with reference to the repentance concept. Bruce sees the hermeneutical aim of this adaptation by calling it a derived principle, 1&2 Cor., p. 193. The obscurity, Hanson, SPTT, p. 190, of the quotation is brought about by its closeness to, yet divergence from, the language of Ex. 34:34 while, at the same time, the context of Exodus gives the important key to its understanding, Barrett, 2 Cor., p. 122.

<sup>2</sup>περιαιρεῖται τὸ καλυμμα.

<sup>3</sup>Oepke, "καλυμμα," p. 560, states that possibly ἐπιστρέφειν stood in Paul's copy of the LXX. But there is no LXX MS evidence for this. If ἐπιστρέφειν was in the LXX text before Paul, he has given a moral sense to a local one, Roger Le Déaut, "Traditions Targumiques Dans Le Corpus Paulinien?," Biblica 42 (1961), p. 44.

Onkelos reads: "But when Mosheh went in before the Lord to speak with Him, he removed the veil until he came out."<sup>1</sup> In LAB<sup>2</sup> three events are apparent: 1) Moses was ignorant of the glory of his face; 2) the people did not recognize him; 3) when Moses found out regarding the glory, he made the veil. In MR Song of Solomon<sup>3</sup> Ex. 34:34 is quoted as a support for God's reason for having Israel construct a Tabernacle: it was no longer becoming for God to speak to Israel in the open as in the past. Therefore the Tabernacle was to act as the place where God would meet with man. In the Mekilta<sup>4</sup> the term "saying" is expounded to mean that the message was spoken immediately after it was first heard. Ex. 34:34 is quoted to support the interpretation that Moses came directly out of the tent of meeting and spoke the words of God to Israel.<sup>5</sup> Martin McNamara, in two works,<sup>6</sup> notes the similarities between Paul's use of ἐπιστρέψῃ and that of Pseudo-Jonathan on Ex. 33:7.<sup>7</sup> Ps. Jon. notes that

---

<sup>1</sup>וְכָל עַלִּיל מֹשֶׁה לִקְדָּם יְיָ לִמְלֵלָא עֲמִיהּ מַעֲדֵי יְת בֵּית,  
Etheridge, TOJ.

<sup>2</sup>M. R. James, The Biblical Antiquities of Philo (London: Society For Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1917), 12:1, p. 110.

<sup>3</sup>Freedman, MR Song of Solomon, p. 165.

<sup>4</sup>Tractate Pishaon Ex. 12:ff.

<sup>5</sup>Lauterbach, Mekilta I, p. 11.

<sup>6</sup>McNamara, NTPT, pp. 168-81 and TT, pp. 111ff.

<sup>7</sup>Etheridge, TOJ, Ex. 33:7, "and it was that when

this turning of Israel in Ex. 33:7 is equal to one turning in repentance "in precisely the same sense as does 2 Cor. 3:16."<sup>1</sup>

R. Le Déaut, in considering ἐπιστροφή, observes the relationship between Ps. Jon. and Paul<sup>2</sup> and notes that εἰσπορεύετο exactly renders the מוֹלֵךְ of the Targum. "Du reste, la formule paulinienne ἡνίκα δὲ ἐάν (s.e. τις) ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς κύριον ressemble étrangement à la phrase du Targum: 'קדם ... דהדר בהתבא'."<sup>3</sup> Given the antiquity of the Targum, it becomes a weighty probability that Paul shares in at least the conceptual tradition of this rendering.<sup>4</sup>

Pauline Contribution. Paul's own thinking also paved the way for this conceptuality. He had, no doubt, previously thought through the implications of the

---

anyone turned by repentance with a true heart before the Lord, he went forth to the Tabernacle of the House of Instruction that was without the camp, to confer and pray for the pardon of his sins; and praying, he was forgiven." Paul also appears to have followed the PT of Dt. 30:12-14 in Ro. 10:6-8 and represents Targum Jonathan I on Ex. 7:11 in 2 Tim. 3:8, McNamara, NTPT, p. 169.

<sup>1</sup>McNamara, NTPT, p. 178, and TT, p. 111. McNamara, NTPT, 180, asserts that Paul's thought has shifted from Ex. 34:29ff to Ex. 33:5ff.

<sup>2</sup>R. Le Déaut, Bib. 42:46f.

<sup>3</sup>Le Déaut, Bib., 42:46-7.

<sup>4</sup>"From what we have seen of the portions of TJI not found in any other PT text, we have no difficulty in taking this particular one to Ex. 33,5ff. as pre-Christian. The relation of such passages proper to TJI with the NT appears, in fact, to be the best way of determining the age of many of them," McNamara, NTPT, p. 181.



Christian ministry with reference to the Mosaic covenant. His clashes with the Pharisees would have sharpened his thinking relative to the place of the Mosaic legislation and ritual. With reference to such conflicts and to the passage in 2 Cor. 3, Ernst Käsemann writes:

It is characteristic of Paul's method of argument that the question of credentials should lead immediately to fundamentals, and it is no less characteristic of it for the ideas to tumble over one another and for very different motifs to be loosely linked up by a process of association.<sup>1</sup>

Paul's work of church founding would have given him practical experience in relating the Law to Christian experience. His own personal religious reconstruction would have given him a well-tried perspective and philosophy upon which he would cope with any new religious trend. Any position which asserted its own superiority over that of the Christian ministers would immediately be examined and found to be in error simply by virtue of the insurpassable character of Christ and the quality of His ministry as understood by Paul.<sup>2</sup> If the Corinthian opposition came partially or completely under the guise of orthodox Judaism the comparison with the Mosaic and New covenants would be readily brought to Paul's mind. Such

---

<sup>1</sup>Ernst Käsemann, Perspectives On Paul, ET Margaret Kohl (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1971), p. 148.

<sup>2</sup>2 Cor. 3:14 clearly shows the superiority of Christ as the center of the OT hermeneutic. See also the use of antithetic parallelism in 2 Cor. 3:3, 6, 7-8, 9. Cf. Maurice Carrez, "Présence Et Fonctionnement De L'Ancien Testament Dans L'Annonce De L'Évangile," Recherches De Science Religieuse 63 (1975), p. 327.



is the case in 2 Cor. 3 where Paul, in defending his ministry, points to the superiority of the new covenant over the Old.

The intention of Paul's argument is specifically directed to his opponents and not to Jews in general. The argument which is being answered by Paul is that because Moses was not bold, but rather covered his face, so also should Paul.<sup>1</sup> This leads to a consideration of another term in Paul's argument, *παρρησία*, in connection with the concepts of being veiled and unveiled. Both McNamara and Van Unnik note the Aramaic background of *παρρησία* meant "to uncover the face or head"<sup>2</sup> and indicated "the characteristic of free men and sets them apart from slaves."<sup>3</sup> This sense is clearly relevant to Paul's movement to Moses' covered face. Perhaps the literal sense of *לגלג פניו* may have brought to mind the contrast between Paul and Moses.<sup>4</sup>

The mention of the *παρρησία* of Paul in his ministry must be seen to relate back to 2 Cor. 3:1 and

---

<sup>1</sup>Collange, E2Cor., pp. 104-05.

<sup>2</sup>W. C. Van Unnik, "With Unveiled Face: An Exegesis of 2 Corinthians II 12-18," Novum Testamentum 6 (Jul. 1963), p. 161, *לגלג פניו*.

<sup>3</sup>McNamara, NTPT, p. 177.

<sup>4</sup>Collange, E2Cor., p. 86, says that the word should be given its primitive sense and not its Jewish-Hellenistic religious sense. Of course a reason for the veil may well be reverence: the end of the glory was just as sacred as its beginning. Cf. 2 Cor. 3:7.

the question of the need for Paul to commend, συνιστάνειν, himself again. It must also look ahead to 4:1ff regarding the renunciation of the hidden things and the manifestation of good to men's consciences. Thus the concept of repentance is placed within the context of Paul's apology for freedom in the ministry of the new covenant. The next problem, then, concerns the subject ἐπιστρέψῃ. Is it Moses, Israel or simply indefinite? This obscurity does not necessarily eliminate Moses as the subject.<sup>1</sup> However, the use of the present tense, περιαίρεῖται is awkward for such an interpretation. In any case ἐπιστρέψῃ is certainly essential to Paul's progression of thought because εἰσεπορεύετο would be meaningless in view of the fact that he makes no reference to the tabernacle.

The immediate context, however, is more supportive to the subject being left purposely indefinite in order for it to apply to the Jews of Paul's day. Paul had just introduced the veiled minds of Israel, vs 14, with a strong adversative, ἀλλά. The implication was that the purpose<sup>2</sup> of Moses in veiling himself was to focus Israel's attention on the crucial issue, God's abiding word, glory and character, rather than the fading

---

<sup>1</sup>Derk William Oostendorp, Another Jesus (Amsterdam: J. H. Kok, N.V. Dampen, 1967), p. 41.

<sup>2</sup>πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀτενίσαι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὸ τέλος τοῦ καταργουμένου.

reflection on Moses' face. This purpose, however, was thwarted as the strong adversative of vs 14 shows.

Instead of enlightenment issuing from the action of Moses, the people became hardened, ἐπωρώθη. The use of the verb elsewhere indicates that it was not the veil which hardened Israel's minds but their own disregard for the truth of God's Word.<sup>1</sup> Moses' veil was designed to hide the temporal glory of the reflection of God. The same veil was still present when the Law was read, vs 14b, and hid the eternal glory of God in Christ. Ἐπωρώθη should therefore not be seen as a result of the veil of Moses. In vs 14 the veil of Moses, hiding temporal glory,<sup>2</sup> became a figure (τὸ αὐτὸ κάλυμμα) of the physical veil but by contrast, in Paul's day, hid the eternal and greater glory in Christ. Verse 15 restates the fact that the veil still remained upon the individual Israelite's heart whereas in vs 14 it was the Israelites' minds, νοήματα. Verse 14b described the removal of the veil by the phrase ἐν χριστῷ while vs 16 clarifies this more

---

<sup>1</sup>It was the mental reflections of the Jews which were hardened. Νόημα is the result of the use of the νοῦς. See Collange, E2Cor, p. 93. See also Ro. 11:7,25 for πωρόω in reference to the hardening of the Jews. Paul, when speaking more broadly, used the terminology ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσεν τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγάζειν τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ χριστοῦ, 2 Cor. 4:4. In 2 Cor. 3:14 Paul wrote ἐπωρώθη τὰ νοήματα.

<sup>2</sup>The Targums offer no parallel to Paul's use of the veil of Moses acting as a cover to hide transient glory, McNamara, NTPT, p. 175. Also Démann, CS 2-3-4:194, n.6.

fully by another reference to Moses' actions.

It is important to bear in mind the fact of the two glories implied in vs 13.<sup>1</sup> The one was temporary on Moses' face. The other was the Lord Himself; the focus on whom Moses tried in vain to encourage by the veil. Also one must keep in mind the radical change in the potentiality offered the Israelite in Paul's day compared with Moses. For Moses, he alone could gaze unveiled at the presence of God, but in Paul's day this privilege was open to all.<sup>2</sup> As a result of Israel's self-hardening they were not aware of this new possibility but if any would repent and turn to the Lord they would become unveiled as those in vs 18. Menzies writes:

. . . when attention is turned from the law to the Lord, i.e. to Christ, then misunderstanding has an end. The law is understood, glory shines unobstructed where the true glory is.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>McNamara, NTPT, p. 171, holds that Paul is "going on some exegetical tradition that took the texts to refer to a special glory that shone from Moses on this occasion." While LAB 12:1 and LXX Ex. 34:29 elaborate somewhat on the Heb. OT it appears that the initial concept of a transient glory on Moses' face is first met in 2 Cor. 3.

<sup>2</sup>The question arises as to the identity of κύριος. Scholars are divided as to its reference to Christ or Yahweh. Lucien Cerfaux, "Kyrios" dans les citations pauliniennes de l'ancien Testament," from Recueil Lucien Cerfaux I (1954), p. 183, sees it to be Christ, while Collange, E2Cor., p. 104, sees it to be Yahweh. The use of the preposition without the article gives "une saveur de nom propre" for Cerfaux. Verse 16 appears to be a modified quotation with vs 17 as its Peshier, Hickling, NTS 21:394, n. 2. Also Dunn, JTS 21:313ff. See τῆς σημερον ἡμέρας in 2 Cor. 3:16 and Ro. 11:8 Qt. Also see Isa. 6:10 in Mk. 4:12.

<sup>3</sup>Menzies, 2 Cor., p. 25.

Paul had clearly established his metaphor by the αὐτό of vs 14 and continued it in vs 16. As Moses alone could be unveiled only when he returned to the Lord so the Israelite of Paul's day could be exposed to the glory of God in Christ if he would turn to Him. The same veil would be lifted. The term ἐπιστρέψῃ, therefore, acts as the cure to the ill of the hardening of vs 14. Israel hardened and turned from God. If they turned back to God the veil would be removed. Therefore, the subject of ἐπιστρέψῃ is left indefinite as part of the transformation of the historical narrative of Exodus into a principle of religious experience.<sup>1</sup>

Conclusion. While the form of this quotation is certainly a difficult midrash, Paul spoke to an audience which was already familiar with the OT allusions and concepts as well as the pervasive work of the Spirit and the relations and contrasts between the Old and New covenants. Le Déaut writes:

Les lecteurs de Paul avaient sans doute connaissance de toute une tradition orale littéraire, illuminant des passages pour nous assez obscurs, et qu'il serait important de déceler dans les couches anciennes de la littérature juive, en particulier dans ce qui nous reste du Targum palestinien.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Peter Richardson, "Spirit And Letter: A Foundation For Hermeneutics," The Evangelical Quarterly 45 (Oct.-Dec., 1973), p. 213.

<sup>2</sup>Le Déaut, Bib. 42:48; also McNamara, NTPT, p. 175. Hickling, NTS 21:394, n. 1, disagrees with McNamara and Le Déaut regarding Paul's dependence on the Targum of Ex. 33:7ff: "The only point of contact that is at all exact is the equivalence between ἐπιστρέψῃ and וְהָיָה ('who

If the specific midrash as a whole was not of Paul's origin it certainly belonged to the earliest stage of the Christian community. The sense of repentance given to the quotation is definitely not unique to Paul as it is present in the Palestinian Targum. McNamara concludes that "apparently Paul is merely Christianizing a midrash already formed within Judaism."<sup>1</sup> Paul brings a radical conceptuality to the passage, however. The heart of his hermeneutic was the work of the Spirit<sup>2</sup> which illuminated the nature of the old covenant by the conditions of the new.

---

used to return'), on which no agreement can be safely based." The inherent sense of returning in repentance must be considered, however. Démann, CS 2-3-4:198, n. 25, also finds it hard to see that Paul used a Jewish tradition here.

<sup>1</sup>McNamara, TT, p. 112.

<sup>2</sup>Richardson, S&L, p. 214.

## LEVITICUS

LEVITICUS 26:11-12, 2 CORINTHIANS 6:16-18ISAIAH 52:11, 2 SAMUEL 7:14Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>	
<u>Ezek. 37:27</u>	<u>Ezek. 37:27</u>	<u>Lev. 26:11-12</u>	
			καθώς
והיה משבני			εἶπεν
עליהם			ὁ θεός
והייתי	καί	καί	ὅτι
להם לאלהים	ἔσται	θήσω	ἐνοικήσω
ומיה	ἡ κατασκήνωσίς	τὴν διαθήκην	
יהיו לי	μου	μου	
עם	ἐν αὐτοῖς	ἐν ὑμῖν	ἐν αὐτοῖς
<u>Lev. 26:11-12</u>			
ונתתי		καί	
משכני		ου	
בתיכם		βεβλύξεται	
ולא תגל		ἡ ψυχὴ μου	
נפשי אתכם		ὑμᾶς	
והתהלכתי		καί	καί
בתוכם		ἐμπεριπατήσω	ἐμπεριπατήσω
והייתי לכם		ἐν ὑμῖν	
לאלהים			
ואתם	καί ἔσομαι	καί ἔσομαι	καί ἔσομαι
	αὐτοῖς	ὑμῶν	αὐτῶν



<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
<u>Lev. 26:11-12</u>	<u>Ezek. 37:27</u>	<u>Lev. 26:11-12</u>
	θεός	θεός
	καί	καί
	αὐτοί	αὐτοί
	μοι	ἔσονται
יְלִי־יְהוָה	ἔσονται	μου
עַמִּי	λαός	λαός
<u>Isa. 52:11</u>	<u>Isa. 52:11</u>	<u>:17</u>
		διό
יֵצְאוּ	ἐξέλθατε	
מִן	ἐκεῖθεν	
הַטִּיבִים	καί ἀκαθάρτου	
יִגְלִי־לָכֶם	μή ἄπτεσθε	
יֵצְאוּ	ἐξέλθατε	ἐξέλθατε
הַכִּי־מִן	ἐκ μέσου	ἐκ μέσου
	αὐτῆς	αὐτῶν
		καί
יִבְרַח	ἀφορίσθητε	ἀφορίσθητε
		λέγει
		κύριος
		καί
		ἀκαθάρτου
		μή ἄπτεσθε
<u>2 Sam. 7:14</u>	<u>2 Sam. 7:14</u>	<u>:18</u>
		καγώ
		εἰσδέξομαι

<u>2 Sam. 7:14</u>	<u>2 Sam. 7:14</u>	<u>:18</u>
		ὕμᾱς
		καί
אני אחיה־לו	ἐγὼ ἔσομαι	ἔσομαι
	αὐτῷ	ὕμῃν
	εἰς	εἰς
לאב	πατέρα	πατέρα
	καί	καί
והוא	αὐτός	ὕμεῖς
יהיה־לי	ἐσται	ἔσεσθῆ
	μοι	μοι
	εἰς	εἰς
לבן	υἱόν	υἱούς
		καί
		θυγατέρας
		λέγει
		κύριος
		παντοκράτωρ

Heb. 1:5. Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα, καὶ αὐτός ἐσται  
μοι εἰς υἱόν.

Rev. 21:7. . . . καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ θεὸς καὶ αὐτός ἐσται μοι  
υἱός.

### Masoretic Variants

Ezek. 37:27. BHK offers no variants for this  
section.

Lev. 26:11-12. BHK only notes A B which may  
reflect the Hebrew בְּרִיחִי.

Isa. 52:11. BHS offers no variants for this section. 4Q Flor. reads  $\aleph 17$  for 17.

### Septuagintal Variants

Ezek. 37:27. The GLXX notes that for  $\epsilon\nu$  αυτοις 106 reads  $\epsilon\pi$  αυτοις = MT and 239 reads  $\mu\epsilon\tau$  αυτοις. The second αυτοις is read as αυτων by the Lucianic groups 22-36-48-51 96-231-763 311-538 V-46-449. The Alexandrian texts A 106-410 198 239-306 403-613 Arab. Arm. Eus<sup>ec1</sup>. +MT read  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  θεον for θεος; 147 precedes θεος with  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  and Aeth follows θεος with αυτων. 106 omits αυτοι. Tyconius Afer reads  $\epsilon\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$  μοι = MT;  $\epsilon\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$  μου is read by the hexaplaric texts Q-88-147 and the Lucianic texts 22-48-51-96-231-763 V-499 Arm (part only) while B reads μου  $\epsilon\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ . For λαος 534 106 Arab Arm (part only) Eus<sup>ec1</sup>. + MT read  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  λαον and Aeth adds μου to λαος.

Lev. 26:11-12. B-M notes that  $d_2$  omits the first  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ - $\upsilon\mu\iota\nu$ . Στησω is read for θησω by b c d g n p t w Arm. Eth. (uid). Διαθηκην is supported by B A g h n v (mg)  $a_2$   $b_2$  Arm. while σκηνην is read by F G M N v(txt) rell Boh. Eth Or. For  $\epsilon\nu$   $\upsilon\mu\iota\nu$  o reads  $\mu\epsilon\theta$   $\upsilon\mu\omega\nu$ : apud nos Eth. The second  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ - $\upsilon\mu\alpha\varsigma$  post (12) λαος 16.77. The second  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  is omitted by a. Βδελυσεται is read for βδελυξεται by s and μη βδελυξητε is read by c. The second  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  is omitted by a. 30 reads  $\upsilon\mu\iota\nu$  for  $\upsilon\mu\alpha\varsigma$ .

With reference to v. 12  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ - $\upsilon\mu\iota\nu$  is after λαος in 130. Περι<sup>α</sup>πητησω is read for  $\epsilon\mu\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\pi\alpha\tau\eta\sigma\omega$  by b w and Philo three out of four times. n reads  $\epsilon\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\iota$  for  $\epsilon\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ . B\*

f x Arm-codd. Boh. read υμιν for υμων and Phil-cod-unic reads εν υμιν one out of four times. Υμεις pr lac (6.) a<sub>2</sub> and is omitted by e and the Old Latin. B A k x support μου and F G M N rell Arm. Boh. Old Latin Philo Or-lat read μοι. b w Arm-ed read εις λαον for λαος. ο' reads την ψυχην μου (v) for την διαθηκην μου. M reads ουκ απομηκυει for ου βδελυξεται. 4Q LXX Lev<sup>a</sup> reads μοι before λαος and εθνος for λαος.

Isa. 52:11. GLXX notes that the first and second εξελθατε read -θετε in 26 V-Q<sup>C</sup>-88-109-736, the Lucianic texts 22-48-51-231-763+62-147+90-130-311+36-93-96-86<sup>2</sup>-233 and the Catena group, 87-91-309-490+49-764-564. Αφησθε is read for απτεσθε by B-V-88, 91-309-490 (Catena group) 456 538 544 Just. Eus.<sup>ec1</sup>. κ puts του before μεσου. Αυτων is read for αυτης by the Lucianic groups 22-48-51-231-763+90-130-311+36-93-96-86<sup>C</sup> 534 Cypr. + Cor. α' σ' read μεμιαμμενου for ακαθαρτου Chr. α' reads εκλεκτωθητε for αφορισθητε 86.

2 Sam. 7:14. B-M note that εγω is preceded by και in b g h n e<sub>2</sub> Sah. Eth. Cyr. Thdt. Chp. and is substituted by και in O C<sub>2</sub>. Εσωμαι is read for εσομαι in g m v c<sub>2</sub>\*.

### New Testament Variants

Vs 16. Tischendorf notes that καθως ειπεν is supported by f vg syr<sup>utr</sup> cop arm Clem<sup>544</sup> Did<sup>tri</sup> Ath<sup>while</sup> λεγει γαρ is read by D\* E Fgr<sup>G d e g go</sup> Tert<sup>pud</sup> Aug<sup>cont.</sup> ep. parm<sub>2</sub> (non item<sup>ep187</sup>), <sup>Laif<sup>217</sup> scriptum est enim.</sup> 137 reads ο κυριος for ο θεος

Libere

while Tert<sup>pud</sup> syr<sup>sch</sup> Aug<sup>cont</sup> ep<sup>parm</sup>2 ~~om.~~ Clem<sup>544</sup> gives a loose rendering ο προφητης. 37 omits οτι. <sup>ev αυτοις per incuriam e 1633. και αυτοις.</sup> Α Εν περιπατησω is read by B\* C D\* F G but εμπεριπατησω is read by κ B<sup>3</sup> D<sup>C</sup> E K L P and others. The αυτων of vs 16 is read by d e f vg Clem<sup>544</sup> Eus<sup>praep</sup>170 and marc<sup>186</sup> cod vene and ps<sup>354</sup> Cyr<sup>hr</sup>181 Ath<sup>704</sup> Epiph<sup>893</sup> al mu Tert<sup>pud</sup>15 Lc<sup>if</sup>217 Hil<sup>288</sup> and others but αυτοις is read by FG<sup>r</sup> G Pg OR<sup>2,124</sup> and 4,233 Eus<sup>marc</sup> ed. Likewise Chr<sup>628</sup> reads εσονται μοι εις λαον και εγω εσομαι αυτοις εις θεον. Μου is read by κ B C P 17. 37. Arm Clem<sup>544</sup> Or<sup>1,756</sup> Eus<sup>marc</sup>186 and ps<sup>354</sup> Dam while μοι is read by D E F G K L al pler it vg rell Orcdd<sup>2</sup> at 4,233 and int<sup>2,159</sup> Eus<sup>praep</sup>170(4,21) Ath<sup>704</sup> Cyr<sup>hr</sup>181 Epiph<sup>893</sup> (Chr vide ante) Euthal<sup>cod</sup> Thrdt al Tert Lcif and others.

Vs 17. Εξελθατε is read by κ B C F G 17 47 71 Euthal<sup>cod</sup> Dam and εξελθετε is read by D E K L P al pler, also Clem<sup>544</sup> (but 680 εξερχεσθε) Chr<sup>628</sup> Thdrt al. F G 37 al aliq αφωρισθητε. Clem<sup>680</sup> Lcif<sup>217</sup> and others read λεγει κυριος while K 4\* Tert<sup>pud</sup>15 and 18 om (al aliq Chr Thphyl post εισδεξ. υμας pon).

Vs 18. F G read εις πατεραν.

### Textual

The writer had several OT passages in mind when he recalled God's promises to adopt and become intimate with His people.<sup>1</sup> With reference to vs 16a, *ὅτι ἐνοικῶσω*

<sup>1</sup>D. Plooiij, "Studies In The Testimony Book,"

ἐν αὐτοῖς has more clear affinity with the Ezekiel passage καὶ ἔσται ἡ κατασκήνωσίς μου ἐν αὐτοῖς <sup>ἡ</sup> that with Lev. 26:11. However, the next phrase of Paul's quotation, καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσω, is clearly aligned with Leviticus 26:12. The rest of Paul's quote is closer to the Ezek. passage with the variations being a change from αὐτοῖς to αὐτῶν and the transposition of μου ἔσονται. The relative compactness and context of the Ezekiel passage makes it the most probable source of the quotation.<sup>2</sup>

The next quotation forms an exhortation based upon the content of the Ezekiel quotation. Introduced by δὲ, it follows Isa. 52:11-12 most closely although it

---

Verhandlungen Der Koninklijke Akademie Van Wetenschappen Te Amsterdam. Afdeeling Letterkunde Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 32, no. 2. (Amsterdam: Uitgave Van De N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-Maatschappij, 1932), p. 20, notes that Paul and a Persian Sage, Aphrahat, quote the passages in 1 Cor. 3:16 and therefore both Paul and Aphrahat found the quotation from the same testimony. However, because Aphrahat writes of "the Apostle" and introduces his very quotation with the words "by the apostle," certainly the Sage got his quotation linked to a Pauline source, not from a pre-Pauline testimony book.

<sup>2</sup>J. De Waard, A Comparative Study Of The Old Testament Texts In The Dead Sea Scrolls And In The New Testament (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965), p. 16, sees the present text due to the conflation of Lev. 26:12 LXX<sup>B</sup>; Ezek. 37:27 LXX<sup>B</sup> and Q. Michel, P&SB, p. 81, calls this a free mixture of the two passages. Joachim Gnilka, "2 Cor. 6:14-7:1 in the light of the Qumran texts and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," from Paul and Qumran, ed. Jerome Murphy-O'Connor (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968), p. 51, prefers the Lev. 26:11f source due to the reference to walking. See Ezek. 20:34 for εἰσοδέξομαι ὑμᾶς. The phrase does not occur in 2 Sam.

has affinities with Ezek. 20:34,41.<sup>1</sup> Turpie notes the similarities of the third quotation in the chain, vs 18, with Jer. 31:33, Ezek. 37:28 and Jer. 31:1 but cites 2 Sam. 7:14 as the nearest representative "from which it differs in being stated directly, not objectively, and plurally, not singularly, and also in adding καὶ θυγάτηρας.<sup>2</sup>

### Contextual

Ezekiel 37:27. The broad context is that of restoration, Chs. 25-48. The immediate context concerns the "conditions and process of restoration."<sup>3</sup> Ezek. 37:15-28 speaks of the future unified and eternal restoration under David. Verse 26 speaks of the covenant of peace God will make with Israel and of His presence among the people as symbolized by God's sanctuary or tabernacle. This divine presence became a witness to the heathen of God's sanctifying work, vs 28.

Leviticus 26:11-12. These verses are in the context of sanctions<sup>4</sup> which formally conclude the holiness

---

<sup>1</sup>Allo, 2 Cor., p. 186, offers Isa. 52:1, Jer. 51:45, Ezek. 20:34, 41, cf. Rev. 18:4. See Ellis, PUOT, pp. 49f, regarding the practice in the Talmud of using καὶ to connect quotations.

<sup>2</sup>Turpie, OTN, p. 63. Also Gough, NTQ, p. 314.

<sup>3</sup>Arnold J. Tkacik, "Ezekiel," The Jerome Biblical Commentary (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968), p. 348.

<sup>4</sup>Roland J. Faley, "Leviticus," The Jerome Biblical Commentary (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968), p. 68.



code. The immediate context is the blessing of obedience,<sup>1</sup> which is "crowned with the inestimable blessing of the Lord's presence."<sup>2</sup> This is based in turn on the covenant of Sinai and the redemption from Egypt.<sup>3</sup>

Isaiah 52:11. The context of this passage is the promised restoration of Israel from Babylon. Yahweh would provide a new Jerusalem which was to be inhabited by those of pure hearts and hands.

2 Samuel 7:14. The context is that of Nathan's oracle to David. David wished to build a house for God but Nathan told him that God would build David a house or dynasty. The personal promise concerns Solomon and his temple construction.

2 Corinthians 6:16-18. Paul, after outlining the present ministry of reconciliation entrusted to him,<sup>4</sup> exhorted the Corinthians to receive the grace of God and His apostles as well.<sup>5</sup> The immediate context involves the plea for separation from close fellowship with unbelievers.<sup>6</sup>

### Hermeneutical

One problem relative to the hermeneutics of this passage concerns whether it is part of the letter as

---

<sup>1</sup>vs 3.

<sup>2</sup>Faley, JBC:Lev, p. 84.

<sup>3</sup>vs 13.

<sup>4</sup>Chapter 5.

<sup>5</sup>Chapter 6:1-13.

<sup>6</sup>6:14-7:1.

dictated by Paul or whether it is an interpolation from a writing which had close affinities with Qumran.<sup>1</sup>

Gnilka sees four OT sources for the composite quotation and notes the use of Ezek. 20:34 or 35 in 1QM 1:2f:

If we apply this background to the understanding of our passage the withdrawal required of Christians is viewed in the perspective of the imminent hour of salvation, and appears as primarily directed to excluding as completely as possible any danger of backsliding or infidelity arising out of their association with their pagan fellow-citizens.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, one argument for the theory of interpolation is the relation of the passage to its present context in 2 Cor.

The affinities of this section are well known.<sup>3</sup> Gnilka stresses that this portion breaks the continuity of the letter (right at the time when Paul is trying to gain the restored affections of the Corinthians) by introducing thoughts about a Christian's relationship to

<sup>1</sup>For a recent summary of the problem and its proposed solutions see Margaret E. Thrall "The Problem Of II Cor. VI. 14-VII. 1 In Some Recent Discussion," New Testament Studies 24 (1977), pp. 132-48. Thrall gives a qualified decision in favor of Pauline authorship and the contextual appropriateness of the passage in its present location. Her insights were supplemented by the members of a seminar on II Cor. which met before the S.N.T.S., Aug. 1975, Aberdeen, including E. Best, I. A. Moir and others.

<sup>2</sup>Gnilka, P&Q, p. 60, gives Lev. 26:11f, Isa. 52:11, Ezek. 20:34, and 2 Sam. 7:14 as the sources.

<sup>3</sup>Bertil Gärtner, The Temple And The Community In Qumran And The New Testament (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1965), p. 52, notes that Ezek. 37:27 occurs in 4Q Flor. Y. Yadin claims that his Temple Scroll calls much of Gärtner's book in question. One must wait for the data to be published to make corrective evaluations. See Acts 7:49; 15:16ff for other NT temple imagery. Waard, CSOT, p. 16, notes that 4Q LXXa fragment text of Lev. 26: 11-12 in lines 17-18 reads καὶ οὐ βδελύξομαι ὑμᾶς whereas all LXX MSS read καὶ οὐ βδελύσσεται ἡ ψυχὴ μου ὑμᾶς.

the unbelievers.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, this passage contains words and conceptualities which do not appear to be compatible with Paul's character and writings.<sup>2</sup> The new sense given to words and the many hapax legomena cause Gnilka and others<sup>3</sup> to conclude that this passage was not written by Paul because the radical separation from the pagan cultural environment "does not seem to harmonize with the Pauline concept of the relationship heathen/Christian."<sup>4</sup> Gnilka, however, does conclude that this passage was written by a Christian (rather than an Essene) who saw a moral (rather than a literal) sense in the call for separation. This presents quite a difference from Qumran conceptuality.

Fitzmyer also finds this to be a "puzzling passage" 1) in that it "radically interrupts" the flow of thought; and 2) because of its completeness as a unit, "like a short homily."<sup>5</sup> He also notes the hapax legomena and sees identification with Qumran thought in the dual-

---

<sup>1</sup>Gnilka, P&Q, p. 48.

<sup>2</sup>Gnilka, P&Q, pp. 48-49. To the six seemingly un-Pauline words mentioned by Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 204, Gnilka, P&Q, p. 53, adds ἐμπεριπατήσω and παντοκράτωρ. Hanson, SPTT, p. 172, calls this a "strange Qumran-like fragment." The words in question are ἑτεροζυγέω, μετοχή, συμφώνησις, συνκατάθεσις, βελιδίον, μολυσμός.

<sup>3</sup>e.g. Hanson, SPTT, p. 172.

<sup>4</sup>Gnilka, P&Q, p. 63.

<sup>5</sup>Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Qumran and the Interpolated Paragraph in 2 Cor. 6, 14-7,1," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 23 (1961), p. 271.

isms, the polemic against idolatry, the temple imagery, the separation emphasis, and the concatenation of OT quotations.<sup>1</sup> Regarding the dualism<sup>2</sup> of Christ and Beliar he notes that Christ's presence in the 2 Cor. pericope proves that the Qumran material has been edited by a Christian.<sup>3</sup> Thus it is generally agreed that, whatever the origin of the catena, its present form shows clear signs of Christian alterations and editions. Thus the link with Qumran must be forged on linguistic and conceptual grounds.

The Concept of Separation. With reference to ἐτεροζυγέω Fitzmyer offers the OT sense of "believing a teaching, following a doctrine" and concludes that the basic idea is of OT derivation.<sup>4</sup> The separation motif, however, "resembles strongly the general Qumran proscription of all contact with outsiders."<sup>5</sup> Of course this motif also, and more fundamentally, bears a strong resemblance to the general OT prescription of holiness. With reference to the use of the OT texts Fitzmyer writes: "The unifying thread running through all the citations is

---

<sup>1</sup>Fitzmyer, CBQ 23:272-73.

<sup>2</sup>Fitzmyer notes 1QS, 1, 7-11 and 1QS 2,16-17.

<sup>3</sup>Fitzmyer, CBQ 23:275.

<sup>4</sup>Fitzmyer, CBQ 23:277. See Psa. 106:28 and Num. 25:3.

<sup>5</sup>Fitzmyer, CBQ 23:278. See CD 17; 1QS 9,8-9; 1QS 5,13-14. For a general account see Gärtner, TCQ.

the theme of God's chosen people, 'God's lot,' to use the Qumran expression."<sup>1</sup> He concludes: "We are faced with a paragraph in which Qumran ideas and expression have been reworked in a Christian cast of thought."<sup>2</sup> He admits, however, that how the paragraph became inserted into 2 Cor. remains a mystery.<sup>3</sup> The fact the idea of God's chosen people is of OT extraction and not unique to Qumran blunts this conceptuality being a formulative influence from Qumran. Regarding the strong opposition to idols in 2 Cor. 6:16, Fitzmyer notes 1QS 2,16-17 in passing but writes that this does not show a "common conceptual background" with Paul.<sup>4</sup>

We conclude that the OT conceptual derivation coupled with the reworked character of the material makes unnecessary a direct link with Qumran. It is more probable that both Qumran and Paul share the same OT conceptuality at this point. Paul gave the material a Christian cast and the Qumranites supplied their own views as seen in their literature. A direct link should not be presupposed between the passage and Qumran.<sup>5</sup>

Temple Imagery. Another problem for Pauline authorship is seen by some to be the contextually foreign

---

<sup>1</sup>Fitzmyer, CBQ 23:278.      <sup>2</sup>Fitzmyer, CBQ 23:279.

<sup>3</sup>Fitzmyer, CBQ 23:280.      <sup>4</sup>Fitzmyer, CBQ 23:277.

<sup>5</sup>See Lev. 26:1 for the need to separate from idolatry and Lev. 26:13 for the concept of the yoke, ζύγος.

concept of the temple.<sup>1</sup> But it can be countered that the legitimate introduction of a new subject should not be called "foreign." Fitzmyer notes that in 1 Cor. 6:19 Paul speaks of the individual as the temple.<sup>2</sup> Qumran always speaks of the community as the temple, never the individual, and it is the Qumran collective image that appears in 2 Cor. 6:16 rather than Paul's individuated conceptuality.<sup>3</sup> But this cannot be used to show a special Qumran influence because elsewhere Paul uses both images.<sup>4</sup> Even if the collective concept could be ultimately traced to Qumran, several (see note 4) Pauline passages use the terminology and show that Paul's own conceptuality accounts for the temple imagery in 2 Cor. 6:16 without having to postulate a non-Pauline origin.

Introductory Formula. The IF is also compatible with Pauline usage.<sup>5</sup> This catena<sup>6</sup> is introduced with an

---

<sup>1</sup>See 1 Cor. 3:16-17 and Eph. 2:21-22, however.

<sup>2</sup>Fitzmyer, CBQ 23:277, n. 18.

<sup>3</sup>The combined Alexandrian and Western support for the ἡμεῖς of 2 Cor. 6:16 is to be preferred. The οὐμεῖς was probably suggested by 1 Cor. 3:16 and 2 Cor. 6:14 and 17 as noted by Bruce M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary On The Greek New Testament (London: United Bible Societies, 1971), p. 580.

<sup>4</sup>1 Cor. 6:19 represents the temple as the individual; in 1 Cor. 3:16-17 Paul speaks of the community as the temple. Eph. 2:21-22 also clearly shows that the believers collectively are the temple.

<sup>5</sup>Barrett, 2 Cor., p. 200, writes that Paul could have used this IF. See Ro. 9:15, 25; 2 Cor. 6:2 (Gal. 3:10) 2 Cor. 4:6 for similar, but not identical, IF.

<sup>6</sup>Swete, IOTG, p. 400. Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 215,

unusual formula only used here in the NT. This IF has a Qumran example in CD 6, 13; 8; 9 (אשר אמר אל) but is found neither in the OT nor the Mishnah.<sup>1</sup>

Early Jewish Usage. The affinities of the passage with Qumran have been examined above. The following sections will explore affinities with select early Jewish literature and Philo.

Regarding the Lev. 26:11-12 passage, Midrash Rabbah<sup>2</sup> makes a distinction between tabernacle and pledge. God is quoted as saying that if the people sin "the Temple will be seized in pledge." The verse supporting this is Lev. 26:11: "And I will set My Tabernacle (mishkani) among you." The reader is then instructed not to read "mishkani" but "mashuni" (my pledge), the interpretation being that where tents shall stand they equal tabernacles but when they are destroyed they become pledges.<sup>3</sup>

Lev. 26:11f is also used in MR<sup>4</sup> of what could have been if God had walked among His people. MR<sup>5</sup> also speaks of the comfort that would be brought when God comes to His people. Targum Onkelos reads:

And I will set my Tabernacle among you, and My word shall not reject you. And I will make My Shekinah dwell among you, and I will be to you Eloha,

---

calls this conflation a "testimonium."

<sup>1</sup>Fitzmyer, CBQ 23:279. Also Waard, CSOT, p. 16.  
We support the IF reading as given on p. 135 above. See pp. 139-40 for variants.

<sup>2</sup>MR:Ex., p. 389.

<sup>3</sup>MR:Ex., pp. 389-90.

<sup>4</sup>MR:Lam., p. 15.

<sup>5</sup>MR:Lam, p. 181.



and you shall be a people before me.<sup>1</sup>

Paul finds no hermeneutical kinship with these early interpretations but he does have a basic affinity with MR regarding Isa. 52:11. Midrash Rabbah,<sup>2</sup> on Ex. 15:18 shows that the Isaiah passage is interpreted messianically. Paul has placed Isa. 52:11 into the context of the messianic age. Hans Dieter Betz argues that *καὶ ἐλθόμενοι ὑμᾶς* is not an OT quotation but is rather an interpretation of the 2 Sam. 7:14 quotation which follows.<sup>3</sup> He notes that 2 Sam. 7:14 is quoted in 4Q Flor. 1:10-11 where "Son" equals the Davidic Messiah. However, the addition of *θυγατέρας* shows a clear distinction from Qumran literature.<sup>4</sup>

Philo. Philo makes use of Lev. 26:11f in several locations. With reference to God taking those who are spiritually fit unto Himself Philo quotes "*καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι λαός . ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος*," with Ex. 6:7 preced-

<sup>1</sup>Translation by Etheridge, TOJ, Lev. 26:11f.

<sup>2</sup>Freedman, MR:Ex., p. 185.

<sup>3</sup>Hans Dieter Betz, "2 Cor. 6:14-7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?," Journal of Biblical Literature 92 (1973), p. 97. Also J. M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References In Qumran Literature," Journal of Biblical Literature 75 (1956), p. 177.

<sup>4</sup>Betz, BJS 92:97-98. Ellis, PUOT, p. 144, notes that the hermeneutical deviations in this catena seem to be designed for a messianic-age fulfillment. The significant addition of "daughters" may be a recollection of Isa. 43:6, cf. Barrett, 2 Cor., p. 201.

ing.<sup>1</sup> Speaking of God walking in the "rich and fertile souls" Philo quotes "περιπατήσω γάρ φησιν ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ἔσομαι ὑμῶν θεός."<sup>2</sup> Those who are purified are promised that "περιπατήσω ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ἔσομαι ὑμῶν θεός."<sup>3</sup> God will walk in the soul of the wise man as He would walk in a city.<sup>4</sup> Finally he writes "οὗτος ὃς φησιν ὁ προφήτης τὸν θεὸν ἐμπεριπατεῖν οἷα βασιλείῳ."<sup>5</sup> In light of Philo's use of ἐμπεριπατεῖν to equal the indwelling of God in man Paul's ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς appears to interpret ἐμπεριπατεῖν as also being divine indwelling. The verb ἐνοικέω is not used of God in the LXX and Paul clearly has excluded institutional contingency from God's presence with men.<sup>6</sup>

Conclusion. The unity of sense in these quotations is striking.<sup>7</sup> Paul has bound this catena together within a promise-fulfillment schema (ταύτας οὖν ἔχοντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας κτλ 2 Cor. 7:1) as a basis for exhortation to purity. The conceptuality is the underlying continuity and consistency in the character of God. The Solomon-

---

<sup>1</sup>De Sac. A. et C. 87.      <sup>2</sup>De Mut. 266.

<sup>3</sup>De Somn. I 148.      <sup>4</sup>De Somn. II 248.

<sup>5</sup>De Praem. 123. Philo continues " . . . καὶ γὰρ ἐστι τῷ ὄντι βασίλειον καὶ οἶκος θεοῦ σοφοῦ διάνοια."

<sup>6</sup>Barrett, 2 Cor., p. 200. Cf. Mt. 18:20.

<sup>7</sup>See also Ro. 3:10-18, 9:25f, 15:9-12. Bruce writes that their cohesion produces a "comprehensive combination of admonition and promise by God to his people," Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 216.

Church transference manifests the effects of the Christian concept of adoption of sonship.

We have concluded that the conceptuality of the catena is based on OT imagery and is not foreign to Pauline thought. This is not to assert, however, that Paul was the originator of the series. Longenecker, for example, classes this passage along with 1 Cor. 14:2 and 15:45 as pre-Pauline text-forms.<sup>1</sup> Whatever the source of the catena, Paul has incorporated it into his arguments and, in doing so, becomes responsible for its remarkable hermeneutic.

Paul's reading of ἐνοικήσω is not found in the OT and functions as a paraphrase<sup>2</sup> of Ezekiel's ἔσται ἡ κατασκήνωσίς μου. Plummer reasons that this substitution is designed to make the quotation better conform to Paul's purpose.<sup>3</sup> However, the two phrases give equivalent and equally suitable meanings.

What is striking about the catena is the transferences of subject that have taken place between the OT and the Church. The Ezek. passage, which promised Israel the eternal presence of God among His people, becomes in

---

<sup>1</sup>Longenecker, TB 21:29. See also Ellis, PUOT, p. 146.

<sup>2</sup>This goes against Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 209, who sees the first part of 2 Cor. 6:16 to be a paraphrase of Lev. 26:11 with the actual quotation of Ezek. 37:27 following.

<sup>3</sup>Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 11.

2 Cor. 6 the presence of God in His temple, the Church. Isa. 52:11, which spoke of redemption from captivity and the need to leave the uncleanness of Babylon, becomes an exhortation to remain unspotted by the evils of the Corinthian culture.<sup>1</sup> The subject of 2 Sam. 7:14, Solomon, becomes the elect of the Church. What is more, all three quotations are called promises<sup>2</sup> which directly relate to the Corinthian readers.

To try to unravel completely the hermeneutical process which led to such a transference is difficult, if not impossible, for the student of today. But the key to the process is Paul's understanding of the Messiah as Jesus of Nazareth who had begun a new work of redemption among a new chosen people.<sup>3</sup> For Paul the Church was the new Israel and it was this fact that enabled him to adopt the passages in this catena as promises for the Church. Therefore, within this context, passages of promise for Israel are essentially promises for the faithful, or remnant, of Israel which, for Paul, was the Church, the true community of God. While this involves a transference of attributes from the Messiah to the Church, there is

---

<sup>1</sup>Johnson, QNT0, p. 305, places the interpretation into its historical context when he writes that Paul "sees in the departure from Babylon a departure from corrupt and corrupting associations, and in the ceremonial defilement a symbol of spiritual defilement." See also Menzies, 2 Cor., p. 51 and Allo, 2 Cor., p. 187.

<sup>2</sup>2 Cor. 7:1.

<sup>3</sup>e.g. Ro. 9:6-9 and Eph. 1:4. See pp. 343ff below.

also a progression from cultic to moral purity.<sup>1</sup> It is most likely, however, that the cultic and ethical concepts were present in the original OT sense. This perspective does not ignore the context of the OT passages but is, in fact, dependent upon the historical framework of Israel's history. There is also a continuity of deity from the OT to Paul. Thus the OT is used to guide the piety of the Christian community.

---

<sup>1</sup>Dodd, AS, p. 106. Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 215. See Barrett, 2 Cor., p. 201, who calls this a "new, non-cultic interpretation."

## NUMBERS

NUMBERS 14:16, 1 CORINTHIANS 10:5Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
סחטשׁו	κατέστρωσεν	κατεστρώθησαν
במדבר	αὐτούς	γάρ
	ἐν	ἐν
	τῇ	τῇ
	ἐρήμῳ	ἐρήμῳ

Masoretic Variants

BHK notes that evidently the LXX translated סחטשׁו (to spread out<sup>1</sup>) instead of סחטשו (to slaughter) when it adopted κατέστρωσεν.

Septuagintal Variants

Brooke-McLean note that καί precedes κατεστρώσεν in Gx, an Armenian variant and the Syro-hexapla. p reads κατεστρέψεν, Theodoret reads καταναλώσεν, the Old Latin, contriuit, and the Ethiopic, occidit.

---

<sup>1</sup>Contrary to this, M&M, p. 333, refer one to Papyri Graeci Musei Antiquarii publici Lugduni-Batavi, Cii. 28, edited by C. Leemans, for a 163-2 B.C. derived sense of "overthrow," "prostrate," for סחטשׁ as in 1 Cor. 10:5. Thus there is no evidence for a non-MT basis.

## New Testament Variants

Tischendorf lists no variants for this passage.

### Textual

The verb has been changed from third singular active to third plural passive<sup>1</sup> with the αὐτοῖς of the LXX being deleted presumably by virtue of its redundancy and implication in the passive sense of the verb.

### Contextual

In the OT context the nation Israel had just received the message of the twelve spies and were viewing with horror the impossible task of entering Canaan. Only the sudden appearance of the glory of Yahweh saved Joshua and Caleb from being stoned by the people. Yahweh then gave the verdict that He would destroy His nation and begin again with Moses. At this point Moses interceded for Israel, pleading the slander which would come upon the character of God if He were to carry out His plan of destruction. Numbers 14:16 is a theoretical slanderous remark: God was not able to lead His people into the land and consequently had to destroy them in the desert. This quotation, then, is actually a sentence which Moses imaginatively put into the mouths of the scoffing nations

---

<sup>1</sup>Paul adopted a passive, possibly reverential, but retains God as the understood subject. Yahweh was the subject in the OT and θεός is the implied referent in 1 Cor. 10:5 where the destruction is linked with the ill-pleasure of God.



if they should hear that God had destroyed Israel.

The New Testament context is the freedom and authority of the apostle. He concluded 1 Cor. 9 by showing that his main goal was not the exercise of his rights but the effective striving to win men to Christ while maintaining his own personal discipline. Chapter ten commences an illustrative argument showing that though one has a relationship with God, he must still keep himself from the vagaries of human lust and pride. This has arisen from Paul's remarks in 1 Cor. 9:26 about being excluded himself due to personal lack of discipline and from the Corinthians' tendency to participate in local idolatrous practices. Though all Israel had a common share in the blessings of God,<sup>1</sup> they were not all pleasing to God. The quotation from Numbers functioned as one of several historical examples (τύποι)<sup>2</sup> from which the Corinthians could benefit and learn.<sup>3</sup>

### Hermeneutical

The "Following Rock." Any full treatment in the

---

<sup>1</sup>1 Cor. 10:1-5.

<sup>2</sup>1 Cor. 10:6.

<sup>3</sup>A. Feuillet, "L'Explication 'Typologique' Des Événements Du Désert In 1 Cor. 10:1-4," Studia Montis Regii 8 (1965), has attributed the concepts here to three figures 1) the prefiguration of baptism, 2) the prefiguration of the eucharist, and 3) the identification of the rock with Christ.

commentaries<sup>1</sup> of this quotation is often eclipsed by an extensive examination of the preceding verse which speaks of the following rock. Héring<sup>2</sup> does not mention 1 Cor. 10:5 at all while Grosheide simply writes that "nearly all of those who departed from Egypt died in the desert (cf. Num. 14:16)."<sup>3</sup> But it is well to repeat that Num. 14:16 is not a historical narrative of the events of Israel's downfall but merely a conjecture of Moses regarding what the Egyptians might say if God destroyed Israel. Bruce<sup>4</sup> rightly notes Num. 14:20-24, 28-35 and Deut. 1:34-40 as substantiation for Israel's wilderness destruction rather than Num. 14:16.

Though there is no explicit quotation in 1 Cor. 10:1-4 there is much that scholars have used in evaluating Paul's hermeneutical conceptions regarding the Exodus event. Therefore, these verses are deserving of treatment here in relation to vs 5.

---

<sup>1</sup>In some of the volumes specifically devoted to NT quotations, Toy, QNT, and Turpie, OTN, do not list this passage while Gough, NTQ, p. 67, lists the text without commenting upon it. Ellis, PUOT, p. 153, judges this to be an allusion. A large single volume, comprising numbers 2, 3 and 4, Cahiers Sioniens is devoted to a consideration of Moses in the NT. Of its many helpful articles not quoted in this paper the ones by Geza Vermes, "La Figure De Moïse au Tournant Des Deux Testaments," and by Paul Démann, "Moïse Et La Loi Dans La Pensée De Saint Paul," are the most notable.

<sup>2</sup>Héring, 1 Cor., p. 86.

<sup>3</sup>Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 222.

<sup>4</sup>Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 92.

Jewish Tradition. Much of what has been written concerning this passage evolves around the supposed use of the Jewish legend of the following rock.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps the earliest mention of this tradition is in Liber Biblicarum Antiquitatum 11, 5.<sup>2</sup> Moses, while on Sinai, received not only the Law but was shown the Tree of Life by which he made sweet the water of Mara. This sweetened water went with Israel for forty years and followed the nation up into the hills and down into the plains. In LAB 10, 7, an actual well of water following the nation is spoken of as part of God's provision.

In the Tosefta Sukkah III, 11<sup>3</sup> the well is described as being like a rock the size of a large water vessel which traveled with Israel up the mountains and down into the valleys. In III, 12-13, the well is seen to make mighty streams and a great river which flowed into the Mediterranean Sea bringing in return precious goods from all over the world. This was derived from Dt. 2:7 where Israel in Edom had no goods but was promised that they would lack nothing.

One view sees the synagogal midrash as Paul's source of this tradition. This midrash was theoretically

---

<sup>1</sup>See S-B vol. 2, pp. 435f. for the literature concerning the Torah/Wisdom/Water motif.

<sup>2</sup>James, Pseudo Philo.

<sup>3</sup>A. W. Greenup, trans., Sukkah, Mishna And Tosefta (London: Society For Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1925).

developed by the haggadist linking Ex. 17:3ff with Num. 20:2ff where a rock was spoken of near both Rephidim and Massah. In both passages the waters are from Meribah.<sup>1</sup> Thus the haggadist concluded that it must have been the same rock which had followed Israel.<sup>2</sup>

Diez Macho gives the translation from Neofiti

Num. 5:19:

And since the well (namely the rockwell) was given to them as a gift, it became strong overflowing streams, and it ascended to the top of the mountains and went down with them to the deep valleys.<sup>3</sup> (*Italics mine*)

Macho, contrary to Doeve, concludes that this does not rest on a midrashic, but rather on a targumic explanation. He sees it as deriving from a wrong translation of the name of a city B<sup>e</sup>era in Num. 21:16 as the noun b<sup>e</sup>ēr which means "well" and also from a wrong translation of Mattana, a city, in Num. 21:18 as "gift."<sup>4</sup> The motif of the following well going up into the mountains and down into the valleys appears also in the PS. Jon and Frag. Targums on Num. 21.<sup>5</sup> Thus this tradition was contemporary with

---

<sup>1</sup>Ex. 17:7 and Num. 20:13.

<sup>2</sup>Doeve, JHSG, pp. 110-11.

<sup>3</sup>Macho, RDPT, p. 232.      <sup>4</sup>Macho, RDPT, p. 232.

<sup>5</sup>Etheridge, TOJ, pp. 409-13. See also Stanislas Lyonnet, "Saint Paul Et L'Exégèse Juive De Son Temps," from Mélanges Bibliques Rédigés En L'Honneur De André Robert (Tournai: Desclée & Cie Éditeurs, 1957), for targumic influence on Paul in Ro. 10:6-8, 2 Tim. 3:8, 1 Cor. 10:4 and Bruce J. Malina, The Palestinian Manna Tradition (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968), p. 99, for Paul's use of current traditions. Myles M. Bourke, "The Eucharist And

Paul. The manner in which Paul adopted this legend will next be considered.

Pauline Adaptations. In Paul's passage he never refers to the physical rock or well mentioned in the Jewish traditions.<sup>1</sup> His rock is the Messiah alone.<sup>2</sup> His basis was the historically considered provision which was made for the Israelites in the wilderness. Paul's double use of πνευματικόν in vss 3-4 refers to the supernatural origin of the nourishment to which the manna and water pointed. What was emphasized was the presence of the Messiah even with ancient Israel and the ensuing spiritual blessings.<sup>3</sup> We see no endorsement or propaga-

---

Wisdom In First Corinthians," Analecta Biblica 17-18, Vol. I (Rome: E Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1963), sees Paul to be dependent on the wisdom tradition in general but does not see any evidence for one book in particular.

<sup>1</sup>Feuillet, SMR 8:131, writes that Paul's perspective is "très loin de la puérile légende rabbinique, que Paul pourrait n'avoir utilisée que pour en prendre le contrepied."

<sup>2</sup>Hamerton-Kelly, PWSM, p. 132, n. 2, notes that CD 8:6 identifies the springs of Num. 21:18 with the Torah and concludes that 1 Cor. 10:11 expresses "the same basic hermeneutical assumption" as Qumran. But does it? Paul did not present a typological relationship. For the apostle the Messiah was actually present in the OT event and not a type. What the Qumran passage does is make clear that in the first century A.D. the provision of water during the Sinai wanderings was a subject of metaphysical speculation. While the Qumran image of Torah and Paul's Messianic identification may have a common share in the wisdom literature tradition, no direct links between them are apparent.

<sup>3</sup>Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 91; Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 221; for "Spiritual" see, 2:10f; 12:1; 15:44; Ro. 1:11; 7:14. Héring, 1 Cor., p. 86, notes that the adjective

tion of the fanciful Jewish myth.<sup>1</sup> The Hebrew and LXX text uses "The Rock" for Yahweh<sup>2</sup> and Paul identified the pre-incarnate Christ with the Angel of the Lord who went

---

"obviously refers, not to anything immaterial, but to something supernatural and heavenly." We agree with Feuillet who concludes: "La meilleure interprétation de πνευματικός est aussi la plus obvie: cet adjectif met les réalités qu'il qualifie en relation, soit avec l'Esprit divin, soit avec le régime de l'Esprit ou ère Messianique ouverte par la venue de Jésus en ce monde." SMR 8:126, and "On le voit, dans les Épîtres pauliniennes πνευματικός est une caractéristique essentielle de réalités de l'économie chrétienne," SMR 8:127. This Christian economy is typified by the faithfulness of Christ. The Rock already had a typical significance in the OT and "following" became a sign of continuing faithfulness. See Oscar Cullmann, "πέτρα," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament VI (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1968), p. 97. Leonhard Goppelt, "τύπος," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament VIII (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972), p. 246, concludes that πνευματικός means "according to the Spirit of God." Πνευματικός occurs 25 times in the NT and 14 times in 1 Cor.

<sup>1</sup>E. Earle Ellis, "A Note On First Corinthians 10:4," Journal of Biblical Literature 76 (1957), p. 56, concludes that Paul and the rest of Jewish literature are related more to the interpretation of the OT than to each other. However, one must assert that Paul was influenced by the legend. The "following" concept is not accounted for by the OT texts. We agree with Eduard Schweizer, "πνεῦμα, πνευματικός," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament VI (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1968), p. 437, n. 707, who writes that the rock in 1 Cor. 10 was a "miraculous, non-earthly rock from God's world." While Paul's use of "following" is a direct link with the Jewish legend and the rock imagery was drawn from the miraculous supply of water from an actual store during the wilderness journey, Paul's rock is the spiritual presence of the heavenly Messiah.

<sup>2</sup>Regarding the LXX rendering of rock by θεός in Dt. 32, Thome Wittstruck, "The So-Called Anti-Anthropomorphisms In The Greek Text Of Deuteronomy," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 38 (1976), p. 32, notes that this could be "a non-figurative rendering of a metaphor, which is a legitimate translation practise. The referent is made clear."



with Israel.<sup>1</sup>

1 Cor. 10:1-4 was designed to demonstrate the free participation of all Israel in the blessings of Yahweh in order to show that such participation still required consistent personal morality. This pattern of divine sovereignty and human responsibility was a part of the early Christian understanding.<sup>2</sup> The continuity between the OT and NT here was the plan and provision of God in relation to the moral behavior of its recipients.<sup>3</sup> This "first sketch"<sup>4</sup> of the Messianic community provided a rich source for those who saw the Person and plan of God to continue from the OT to the NT era. The pivotal

---

<sup>1</sup>Ex. 14:19; 23:2ff; 32:34; 33:2, 14ff; cf. Acts 7:30, 38, Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 91. Feuillet, SMR 8:132-33. Lucien Cerfaux, "'Kyrios' Dans Les Citations Pauliniennes De L'Ancien Testament," Recueil Lucien Cerfaux I (Gembloux: Editions J. Duculot, 1954), p. 183, rightly conjectures that this identification of the rock with Christ is more than just a figure and shows early Christian speculation about the manifestation of the λόγος in the OT.

<sup>2</sup>F. F. Bruce, Paul & Jesus (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1974), p. 64.

<sup>3</sup>Maurice Carrez, "La Méthode De G. von Rad Appliquée A Quelques Textes Pauliniens," Revue Des Sciences Philosophiques Et Théologiques 55 (1971), p. 87. See also Traugott Holtz, "Zur Interpretation Des Alten Testaments Im Neuen Testament," Theologische Literaturzeitung 99 (1974), pp. 26-27. The entire Exodus theme in the NT is discussed by R. E. Nixon, The Exodus In The New Testament (London: The Tyndale Press, 1963), and David Daube, The Exodus Pattern In The Bible (London: Faber and Faber, 1963).

<sup>4</sup>Cerfaux, RCL I, p. 182.



and underlying conceptuality is seen in 1 Cor. 10:6, 11.<sup>1</sup> Even the apocalyptic language of 1 Cor. 10:11 was understood in terms of the preliminary salvific activity of Yahweh in Israel's history.<sup>2</sup> Paul once again shows his distinctive Christological hermeneutic. It was only the historical appearance of the Messiah on the earth that allowed Paul to give this deeper significance to the history of Israel.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The typological relations seen in the Exodus were, of course, also prevalent in Judaism. J. K. Howard, "Christ Our Passover: A Study Of The Passover-Exodus Theme In I Corinthians," Evangelical Quarterly 41 (1969), p. 104, notes the relation between Jewish proselyte baptism and the passing through the Red Sea. The proselyte would pass from Heathenism through baptism to the "promised land" of Judaism. See also Harald Sahlin, "Der Neue Heilsexodus Bei Paulus," Judaica 7 (1952), p. 135 and Michel, P&SB, p. 157. Philo Leg. All. II 86 identifies the rock with the wisdom of God.

<sup>2</sup>Leonhard Goppelt, "Paul And Heilsgeschichte," ET Mathias Rissi, Interpretation 21 (1967), p. 317, and Paul Neuenzeit, Das Herrenmahl (München: Kösel-Verlag, 1960), p. 52. Lucien Cerfaux, "L'Exegese De L'Ancien Testament Par Le Nouveau Testament," from Recueil Lucien Cerfaux II (Gembloux: Editions J. Duculot, 1954), p. 214, sees this to be an analogical rather than allegorized use of the OT which Paul only utilized in moderation, RLC I, p. 188. Calvin Roetzel, "The Judgment Form In Paul's Letters," Journal of Biblical Literature 88 (1964), p. 305, finds a recurring form of prophetic speech present in several of Paul's pareneses, 1 Cor. 3:16-17; 5:1-13; 10:1-4; 11:17-34. He sees the basic motifs of Claus Westermann's Basic Forms Of Prophetic Speech [1) summons to hear, 2) accusation, 3) message formula, 4) announcement] to be modified in Paul [1) introduction, 2) offense delineated, 3) punishment (sometimes with "therefore") 4) hortatory conclusion]. Roetzel, JBL 88:312, sees these motifs to be applicable to judgments in ecclesiastical rather than individual soteriological contexts but concludes that one may not be certain if Paul has applied these motifs consciously.

<sup>3</sup>Feuillet, SMR 8:134.

Allusion or Quotation? We return now to the quotation itself. If it were not for the fact that the verb καταστρώννυμι occurs only here in the NT and only at Num. 14:16 in the Pentateuch<sup>1</sup> one might assume that <sup>one</sup> <sub>A</sub> is not dealing with a quotation but rather with a summary phrase retrospective to the whole of Israel's wilderness experience. This being a quotation, however, Paul has altered the verb for syntactical reasons.<sup>2</sup> Because Paul is using the phrase as part of his midrashic<sup>3</sup> comment on Israel's history, one would not find such a variation out of place.

The most interesting aspect of this use of the OT passage is that Paul employed the conjectural statement of Moses to speak of the historical facts of Israel's sojourn in the desert rather than other passages which would have been direct narratives of that event. Though the original event pictured by Num. 14:16 never occurred

---

<sup>1</sup>Elsewhere it is used in Judges, once in Job, and in 2 Macc.

<sup>2</sup>McNamara, TT, p. 93, writes, "When speaking of God's relations with the external world, the targumists shy away from making deity the direct subject or object of an action. To effect this, active verbs of the biblical text become passive in the Aramaic renderings, sometimes with a certain amount of violence being done to the Aramaic language." But there is no need to assert a reverential passive here. A random look through 1 Cor. alone shows how frequently Paul uses θεός as the stated subject of an active verb; 1 Cor. 1:20, 27, 28; 2:10; 3:6, 17; 4:9; 5:13; 6:13; 10:5, 13; 12:18, 24, 28.

<sup>3</sup>Davies, PRJ, p. 105. See also MR Num., p. 694 and SS 1:7, p. 63.

it is most improbable that Paul did not know <sup>the Numbers text's</sup> location and context. One would assume, therefore, that he was well aware of his divergence of application. Though the phrase did not narrate the actual event it was used as a convenient historical summary and, in fact, was true to the later facts of Israel's history.

## DEUTERONOMY

DEUTERONOMY 19:15, 2 CORINTHIANS 13:1Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
	ἐπὶ	ἐπὶ
על-פי	στόματος	στόματος
שני	δύο	δύο
עדים	μαρτύρων	μαρτύρων
וא	καί	καί
	ἐπὶ	
על-פי	στόματος	
שלושה-עדים	τριῶν	τριῶν
	μαρτύρων	
יקום	στήσεται	σταθήσεται
	πάν	πάν
דבר	ῥῆμα	ῥῆμα

Mt. 18:16, cf. Jn. 8:17

ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων

ἢ τριῶν σταθῇ πᾶν ῥῆμα

1 Tim. 5:19

ἐπὶ δύο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων

Masoretic Variants

BHK notes that the LXX and Vulgate appear to read כל-דבר. At the present there is no Heb. MSS evidence to support the non-MT reading.

### Septuagintal Variants

B-M note that the first μαρτυρων is omitted by d n Arm. Cyr <sup>10</sup>/<sub>11</sub>. The και is preceded by η in Cyr <sup>1</sup>/<sub>11</sub> and is replaced by η in b d f m n w Cyr <sup>2</sup>/<sub>11</sub> Luc Spec-codd. The second επι στοματος is omitted by b d f m n w Arm. Cyr. Luc. Spec-codd. The second μαρτυρων is omitted by b f m w. Στησεται παν is read as omnium stabit in the Old Latin. For στησεται, f reads σταθη; A F M V W rell Arm. and Cyr read σταθησεται. k omits παν while the Syro-hexaplar from the MS (now lost) of A. Masius reads παν under an obelus ∴. An asterisk precedes ρημα in M.<sup>1</sup>

### New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that while κ<sup>C</sup> reads επι, κ\* and g (ut-stabit) syr<sup>utr</sup> arm<sup>utr</sup> have ινα before ~~τατων~~ επι. 35 17 73 74 a s<sup>c</sup> r<sup>a</sup> Arm Dial <sup>867</sup> place μαρτυρων after τριων. κ 32 46 f vg arm Dial <sup>867</sup> read η before τριων.

### Textual

Paul's omission of the second ἐπὶ στόματος is seen in b d f m n w Arm Cyr. Luc. Spec-codd and his use of σταθήσεται is seen in A F M V W rell arm. and Cyr. The passive voice (σταθη) is also found in Mt. 18:16 and may be evidence for an early Palestinian Heb Pu'al reading in that it differs from the Alexandrian and MT traditions.

---

<sup>1</sup>Stendahl, SSM, p. 181, notes that the quotation form in Mt. 18:16 agrees with LXX<sup>A</sup> and Lucian.

### Contextual

The Deuteronomy passage is from the Book of the Law<sup>1</sup> and dealt specifically with the use of witnesses in the detection and punishment of crimes.

Paul was in the process of informing the Corinthians about his impending visit<sup>2</sup> but still maintained the defensive and apologetic tone which he began in chapter 10:1. Paul's coming was linked with his judgment on the disobedient.

### Hermeneutical

The Two or Three Witnesses. The primary hermeneutical question concerns the meaning which Paul ascribed to the idea of the two or three witnesses. Some commentators surmise that Paul was referring to his three visits.<sup>3</sup> Menzies<sup>4</sup> distinguishes visit from "intention" to visit. Oostendorp notes that "Paul is only one witness even if he has made three visits" and calls this a loose quotation of the law.<sup>5</sup> Plummer<sup>6</sup> supplies three possible meanings. The first is that Paul will carry out

---

<sup>1</sup>Dt. 12:1-28:68.

<sup>2</sup>2 Cor. 12:14-13:10.

<sup>3</sup>Bonsirven, EREP, p. 319; Allo, 2 Cor., p. 335. Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 252, attributes this to "a more general application here than in other NT contexts (cf. Mt. 8:16; 1 Tim. 5:19; Heb. 10:28)."

<sup>4</sup>Menzies, 2 Cor., p. 100.

<sup>5</sup>Oostendorp, AJ, p. 24.

<sup>6</sup>Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 372.

a formal investigation when he arrives.<sup>1</sup>

The second possibility is that Paul meant that he would wait for first-hand evidence rather than hearsay. But this is not necessary because the acts were openly committed. The third interpretation is that Paul spoke of three visits but Plummer concludes that one must remain in doubt as to Paul's exact intent.<sup>2</sup> Bultmann<sup>3</sup> says the three witnesses equal accusations or charges rather than visits. This is compatible with the Damascus Document 9, 17-22 which shows that a single witness may see an act done three separate times. Each time is noted and on the third occurrence a conviction may be brought.<sup>4</sup>

Early Jewish Literature. The OT passage is interpreted with varying degrees of faithfulness to the OT context in other literature. The Mishnah<sup>5</sup> speaks of at

---

<sup>1</sup>Hanson, SPTT, p. 174, concurs. See also Menzies, 2 Cor., p. 100-01, who sees this as a reference to the proper procedure which Paul will execute when he arrives.

<sup>2</sup>Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 372.

<sup>3</sup>Rudolf Bultmann, Der Zweite Brief An Die Korinther, ed. Erich Dinkler (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976), p. 243.

<sup>4</sup>Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Qumran Law of Testimony," Revue de Qumran 8 (1975), pp. 604-05. This may also be related to Ex. 21:29 and the forewarned ox. See also, Philo, on Joseph sec. 235, regarding Joseph's threefold trial of his brethren to see if there was any enmity among them. This may also relate to Mt. 18:15-17 and the three-stage concept of going from private to public accusations.

<sup>5</sup>Danby, Mishnah, Sotah 6:3, p. 299.



least two witnesses needed to condemn a woman for adultery. Onkelos reads: "But upon the word of two or of three witnesses shall the case be confirmed."<sup>1</sup> In the Mekilta<sup>2</sup> a man who enters a ruin and finds a man dying and another holding a bloody knife can do nothing because of Dt. 19:15. In Qumran the passage takes on a more diffuse application. Commenting on the Damascus Document, IX, 16-23 Dupont-Sommer<sup>3</sup> writes that in a case where a capital offence has been seen by only one man "two more witnesses are needed, each of them denouncing the culprit for a new offence: three witnesses in all, therefore."

Pauline Adaptations. Regarding the omission of the second ἐπὶ στόματος and the second μαρτύρων this may be due to a "natural omission"<sup>4</sup> or a desire to abbreviate the quotation<sup>5</sup> or, of course, to a text different from those known at present as has been noted in the Textual section. Because the phrase had become idiomatic one expects to find it in varying text-forms, some containing a fuller (Mt. 18:16) or abbreviated (1 Tim. 5:19) text. Paul's text, in 2 Cor. 13:1, falls somewhere in the

---

<sup>1</sup>Etheridge, TOJ:           על מימר תרין סהדין  
או על מימר הלוה סהדין  
יתקים פהגמא

<sup>2</sup>Lauterbach, Mekilta, III, p. 171.

<sup>3</sup>A. Dupont-Sommer, The Essene Writings from Qumran, trans. G. Vermes (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961), p. 150, n. 4.

<sup>4</sup>Atkinson, JTVI 79:50.   <sup>5</sup>Toy, QNT, p. 46.

middle, therefore Atkinson's suggestion is the more probable.

It is clear that Paul began a new aspect of his thought regarding returning to Corinth in chapter 13. This is the climax to his warnings and exhortations. Whatever the quotation means it must be closely linked with 2 Cor. 13:1 and the rather stark announcement that this would be Paul's third visit. Paul made it clear that he himself would act in judgment.<sup>1</sup> This personal action was linked to his third visit and the quotation. The content of the judgment was given further clarification in vs 10 where Paul spoke of his own power to be sharp in judgment. The emphasis was on Paul's own actions of judgment rather than on a community trial as suggested by some interpretations. There is also no indication that Paul had moved outside of grace and faith and entered into pure law as Hanson suggests.<sup>2</sup> Paul, while certainly contemplating severe measures, was still concerned with edification for all concerned, not destruction.<sup>3</sup>

Paul gave the explanation of his OT quote in vs 2. He had previously warned the Corinthians about their disobedience and if they were still unrepentant upon his

---

<sup>1</sup>"I will not spare . . . .", 2 Cor. 13:2. KJV

<sup>2</sup>Hanson, SPTT, p. 174.

<sup>3</sup>2 Cor. 13:10.

arrival he would not spare any offender. This was a clear way of saying that the visits were to be understood as the three witnesses and that the establishing of every word was equated with the personal judgment of the Apostle.

Paul has adopted a widely used principle from an OT passage. The intent of Dt. 19:15 was that no punishment should be executed unless clear and uncontrovertible proof be brought to the conviction. For this, two or three witnesses were needed to bring about justice. Paul was saying that he had twice witnessed the same acts of disobedience at Corinth. If he came and witnessed the same acts the third time he would have more than enough proof to pass judgment. The details of the OT legal system are revolutionized in the NT church but the spirit of the OT passage (community purity) is maintained. While this phrase had become an idiom Paul clearly used a juridicial principle of OT extraction for the regulation of the Church's piety.

DEUTERONOMY 22:24, 1 CORINTHIANS 5:13Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
	καί	
ובערה	ἐξαρεῖς	ἐξάρατε
	τόν	τόν
הרע	πονηρόν	πονηρόν
מקרנך	ἐξ	ἐξ
	ὑμῶν	ὑμῶν
	αὐτῶν	αὐτῶν

Masoretic Variants

Kittel lists no variants for this passage.

Septuagintal Variants

Brooke-McLean note that ἐξαρεῖτε is read by a b d (-ται) f h p q t w z (mg) a<sub>2</sub> and the Armenian, Old Latin: Roberts' edition of the Lyons Octateuch, and Cyril, ἐξάρατε is read by 18. το is read for τον by d\* f and cyr-ed. ἐξάρατε is read by m\* in the first part of the vs not given above.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf reads ἐξάρατε with κ A B C D\* F G P al fere<sup>15</sup> Euthal<sup>Cod</sup> d e f g vg Bas<sup>eth</sup> 446.467. For ἐξαρεῖτε he notes Stephanus D<sup>3</sup>EL al plu Or<sup>cat</sup>98 Eus.<sup>PS651</sup>, etc. Nestle notes that P<sup>46</sup> reads ἐξαίρετε. κ A B C D\* F G P and others have no καί before ἐξάρατε.

very many

Stephanus with D<sup>3</sup> E L and <sup>very many</sup> others, inserts the καί.  
 (syr<sup>utr</sup>, syr<sup>sch</sup>, syr<sup>P</sup> Or cat<sup>98</sup>  
 Thdrf Dam Chr 159vid)

### Textual

Toy<sup>1</sup> locates this quotation at Josh. 7:13 (LXX  
 ἕως ἂν ἐξάρητε το ἀνάθεμα ἐξ ὑμῶν) but this reading  
 requires Paul to have made more changes than in using  
 the Deut. 22:24 passage. While this does not settle the  
 location of the quote in itself, it is more conclusive  
 when coupled with the fact that Paul normally quotes  
 from the Pentateuch and Psalms and that the quote is more  
 easily recognized as sourced in Deuteronomy. This term-  
 inology occurs at several places throughout Deuteronomy,  
 however.<sup>2</sup> Deut. 22:24 has nearer conformity of sense  
 with the case referred to by Paul.<sup>3</sup> Perhaps Dt. 17:7 and  
 22:24 should be considered equal candidates in that the  
 contexts of both concerned the purging of immorality from  
 the community of God by the harshest of punishments.

Though P<sup>46</sup> is early evidence for the ἐξαίρετε  
 reading and usually follows the Alexandrian text-type, it  
 seems best to adhere to the ruling of the combined testi-  
 mony of κABCD\* and assert the priority of ἐξάρατε. The  
 καί which several Byzantine MSS place before ἐξάρατε may  
 be a later attempt at conformity to the LXX. Thus the  
 single variant from the LXX reading in Paul's citation is

---

<sup>1</sup>Toy, QNT, p. 173.

<sup>2</sup>Deut. 13:5; 17:7b, 12; 19:19; 22:21, 22; 24:7.

<sup>3</sup>Gough, NTQ, p. 81.

the change from second person singular to plural of  
and from Fut. indic. to aor. imperative.  
 ἐξέλθω. This appears, at this point, to be a hermeneutically motivated alteration.

### Contextual

The passage in Deut. 22:24 is in the midst of various apodictic laws regarding the morality of Israel when they would enter the land. The specific at hand was the case of adultery with another man's betrothed. This case is preceded by that of adultery with a woman who has completed the marriage vows.

1 Corinthians 5 opens with Paul's verdict of the man who had his father's wife in immorality.<sup>1</sup> The next verses express an exhortation to holiness and vss 9-11 are designed to clarify Paul's previously misunderstood statement concerning disassociation with immoral people. A summary and conclusion of his thoughts on this matter of immorality are given in vss 12-13.

### Hermeneutical

Even if one cannot be dogmatic regarding which of the several OT passages Paul had in mind, the use of the sense in this passage is not contradictory to its use throughout Deuteronomy. The people of God were to be holy and to purge evil from among them. Paul viewed the Church as the temple of the Spirit and subject to a

---

<sup>1</sup>vss 1-6.

rigorous scheme of holiness. Hermeneutically the change from second singular to plural does no violence to the original as the ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν of the LXX indicates that the subject is considered as a single group consisting of many people. The fact that in Deut. 17:7; 19:19; 22:21, 24; 24:7 the verbs are singular<sup>1</sup> and in 1 Cor. 5 it is in the plural, leads Barrett to see an implication that excommunication was a NT community responsibility. But this would be true in both Testaments and therefore does not provide a satisfactory reason for the change of number. It presupposes that the readers would have been highly familiar with the minutiae of the LXX of Dt. 22:24 and that they would have been insightful enough to perceive the meaning so subtly intimated in the change from singular to plural.

More consistent with the NT context is the fact that Paul has not used an IF for this quotation. It reads as if it were an integral part of the narrative flow and stands as the final word. There seems to be no desire on the part of the Apostle to use this as a proof-text to bolster his argument nor does he use it in an illustrative manner. Ἐξαίρω is only used here in the New Testament<sup>2</sup> though the rest of the quotation's words are

---

<sup>1</sup>Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 133. Although Sperber, JBL 59:282, notes that the plural is evidenced by: Auferetis malignum ex uobis ipsis (Ulysse Robert, Heptateuchi Versio Latina Antiquissima, Lyon 1900, p. 13).

<sup>2</sup>Unless the Byzantine variant ἐξαρθῇ of 1 Cor.



not unusual for Paul. It seems that Paul had thought of the Deuteronomy passages due to the similarity of the immoral man of Corinth with adultery in ancient Israel. While he did not need to quote a passage formally to prove from Scripture that an adulterous man had to be punished, he did see the command to be an evocative and fitting climax for his words. His adaptation of the second plural is a simple continuance of the number he has been using throughout the context in addressing his readers. A mere shift of the number of ἐξαίρω would not effectively communicate community action though the community is certainly implied.

It is noteworthy that Paul would quote a command whose method of fulfillment in Corinth would differ so radically from that in Israel when Deuteronomy was written. Certainly, one assumes Paul was not advocating stoning.<sup>1</sup> Both Barrett<sup>2</sup> and Grosheide<sup>3</sup> assert that the punishment advocated in Corinth was excommunication.

---

5:2 be accepted which is, nevertheless, also an allusion to the Deuteronomy quotation terminology.

<sup>1</sup>In the Talmud, Sanhedrin 87b comments on Ex. 21:23-25. Money rather than life had become the required compensation in order to conform the old law to advanced legal norms. Weingreen, BJRL 34:184, writes: "The primitive law of talio may have had validity in the dim, distant past in ancient Israel; it certainly had no place in Talmudic law, for the principle of monetary compensation seems to have been firmly entrenched."

<sup>2</sup>Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 133.

<sup>3</sup>Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 131.

Paul exhibited a method of using the spirit of the command, to rid the community of evil, without the literal historical method of such ridding.<sup>1</sup> But how different were the effects of the Pauline and OT methods of purification considering 1 Cor. 5:5, παραδοῦναι τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ σατανᾷ εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκὸς κτλ.<sup>2</sup> Paul extracted a principle which allowed for various applications yet still effected the end towards which the original OT passage pointed; purity of the community. This exhibits another use of the OT as an ethical authority for the new people of God, the Church.

---

<sup>1</sup>Paul has omitted the commands for stoning to death, Dt. 22:24a, out of his quotation.

DEUTERONOMY 25:4, 1 CORINTHIANS 9:9Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
		έν
		γάρ
		τῷ
		μωϋσέως
		νόμῳ
		γέγραπται
-κλ	οὐ	οὐ
ορνη	φιμώσεις	κημώσεις
γρ	βοῦν	βοῦν
γρ'α	ἀλοῶντα	ἀλοῶντα <sup>1</sup>

I Tim. 5:18

βοῦν  
ἀλοῶντα  
οὐ  
φιμώσεις

---

<sup>1</sup>With regards to 1 Cor. 9:10, Alfred Resch, *Agrapha* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906), p. 30, on the basis of the use of Dt. 25:4 followed by a dominical saying in 1 Tim. 5:18, finds the same to be the case in 1 Cor. 9:10 although in 1 Cor. the following saying may possibly be an apocalyptic saying. Wendland, *Kor.*, p. 64, also feels 1 Cor. 9:10 is a quotation though he is at a loss to find its source. It seems better to take the δε ἡμᾶς ἐγράφη κτλ to be an answer to the two-fold question immediately preceding.

### Masoretic Variants

BHK lists no variants for this passage.

### Septuagintal Variants

Swete notes that B\* reads  $\phi\epsilon\iota\mu\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  for  $\phi\iota\mu\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  but is corrected to  $\phi\iota\mu\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  by B<sup>b</sup>. B-M note that  $\kappa\eta\mu\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  is only read by Philo and Paul. The reading  $\kappa\eta\mu\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  in Philo is found in the tenth century MS Seldenianus. Probability points to this being a harmonization of Philo to Paul. Philo, De Virt. 145 quotes,  $\beta\omicron\upsilon\nu\ \alpha\lambda\omega\omega\nu\tau\alpha\ \mu\eta\ \phi\iota\mu\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ .

### New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that  $\kappa\eta\mu\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  is read by B\* D\* F G Chrysostom<sup>com.</sup> ad. h. 1. 215 Theodoret 1,179 glossar albertin 127 and others.  $\phi\iota\mu\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  is read by A  $\aleph$  B<sup>3</sup> C D<sup>b</sup> C E K L P (-σησ)<sup>al omh rid</sup> Origen 1,170.388.541 and cat 168 Dial. 817 Chrysostom txt 214 Euthal. cod Cyril esai<sup>430</sup> and Thdr<sup>ad hde Dam al</sup> Nestle adds P<sup>46</sup> and 1739 to those witnesses reading  $\phi\iota\mu\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ .  $\text{Εν γὰρ τῷ μωσσεως νομῷ γεγραπται}$  is read by  $\aleph$  A B C K L P and others along with the Vulgate Armenian Ethiopic Origen 1,388 Dial 817 Euthal. cod Cyril ador 130,  $\text{γεγραπται γὰρ}$  is read by D\* E F G d e <sup>f</sup> g Origen Hilary (i.e. ps<sup>118</sup>).  $\text{Μωσσεως}$  is read by  $\aleph$  B C K L P and many others while A and <sup>very many</sup> others and Stephanus read  $\mu\omega\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ .

### Textual

The textual matter here primarily concerns

whether Paul wrote  $\phi\iota\mu\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  or  $\kappa\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ . Toy writes that "if Paul used the latter term, it must be supposed that he translated this familiar saying from the Aramaic, instead of taking it from Sept."<sup>1</sup> Hanson writes:

It seems likely that Paul's Greek version had  $\kappa\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ , and that it is neither a mistake of memory on Paul's part, nor the effort of a later scribe to smarten up Paul's Greek: the nouns  $\kappa\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  and  $\phi\iota\mu\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  can be used interchangeably in translation Greek.<sup>2</sup>

This interchangeability is apparent in Prov. 26:3 where  $\sigma'$  used  $\phi\iota\mu\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  and  $\alpha'$  and  $\theta'$  used  $\kappa\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  to translate metheg or "bridle."<sup>3</sup> The strongly supported variant reading of  $\phi\iota\mu\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  may be an attempt to harmonize with the LXX and 1 Tim. 5:18.<sup>4</sup> In the end a similar sense is gained by either rendering.<sup>5</sup> The transcriptional probability is stronger in this case that scribes would have altered  $\kappa\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ , which lacks literary lustre,<sup>6</sup> to  $\phi\iota\mu\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ .  $\kappa\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  will be the accepted reading for the

---

<sup>1</sup>Toy, QNT, p. 174. Bonsirven, EREP, p. 332, notes that  $\kappa\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  is a better rendering of the corresponding Hebrew term and clarifies the thought.  $\kappa\eta\mu\acute{\omega}$  does not occur in the LXX and is rare in Patristics; cf. Lampe, PGL, p. 750. See H&R, p. 763, for  $\kappa\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  in Ps. 31 (32):9 and Ezek. 19:4, 9.

<sup>2</sup>Hanson, SPTT, p. 161.

<sup>3</sup>Hanson, SPTT, p. 174.

<sup>4</sup>Héring, 1 Cor., p. 78.

<sup>5</sup>Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 205, n. 4.

<sup>6</sup>Metzger, TCNT, p. 558. Hanson implies just the opposite, SPTT, p. 161, as do M&M, p. 672. Metzger's view is also supported by Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 183, n. 35, who calls  $\kappa\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  an "unliterarische Wort" and says that  $\phi\iota\mu\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  "das sekundäre Angleichung an LXX ist."

purposes of this study.<sup>1</sup>

The only variation from the LXX is Paul's use of κημώσεις. He has duplicated the tense, person and number as well as the syntax of the quotation as a whole. It would appear that κημώσεις was an early, though not widespread, variant in the Greek OT text of the first century.<sup>2</sup>

### Contextual

The quotation is, in its OT setting, surrounded by various laws concerning mercy and justice toward one's fellow countryman. Chapter 24 contains divorce regulations, (vss 1-4) military exemption for newlyweds, (vs 5) humanitarianism where pledges are concerned, (vss 10-13) wages for the poor, (vs 15) death penalties for fathers and sons, (vs 16) fairness for orphans, widows and aliens, (vss 17-18) and gleaning restrictions, (vss 19-22). Chapter 25 discusses humaneness in punishment, (vss 1-3) the present quotation,<sup>3</sup> (vs 4) then a section on Levirate marriage, (vss 5-10).

---

<sup>1</sup>Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 183, settles on κημώσεις noting that κημώ is rare and is not in the LXX therefore a scribal correction would readily go from κημώσεις to φιμώσεις. See also Robertson, 1 Cor., p. lxii.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. p. 181.

<sup>3</sup>Johannes Hempel, Die Schichter des Deuteronomiums (Leipzig: R. Voigtlanders Verlag, 1941), p. 226, finds Dt. 25:4 to be a marginal gloss which later became incorporated into the text.

Dt. 25:4, concerning animals, appears rather unexpectedly in the middle of laws concerning humane treatment of humans. Unlike the other surrounding commands, this one does not have an appended reason for obedience. Its almost proverbial tone gives the impression of a principle rather than a strictly literal agricultural procedure. C. F. Keil writes:

The command not to put a muzzle upon the ox when threshing, is no doubt proverbial in its nature, and even in the context before us is not intended to apply merely literally to an ox employed in threshing but to be understood in the general sense in which the Apostle Paul uses it in 1 Cor. ix. 9 and 1 Tim. v. 18, viz, that a labourer was not to be deprived of his wages.<sup>1</sup>

The ox is not to be muzzled; but why? The OT context outlined various balances which needed to be observed. The poor need their stones, garments and wages; each is put to death for his own sins; the redemption from Egypt is a sign to be generous regarding a pledge and gleaning; even in punishment personal integrity must be respected. Verse 4, then, may well have been understood as a proverbial and figurative summary of the preceding exhortations.<sup>2</sup> Thus the interpretation would be that each must

---

<sup>1</sup>C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, Biblical Commentary On The Old Testament III, ET James Martin (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1867), pp. 421-22. Marie-Louise Henry, Das Tier Im Religiösen Bewusstsein Des Alttestamentlichen Menschen (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1958), p. 27, sees Dt. 25:4 to refer to beasts alone as does S. R. Driver, A Critical And Exegetical Commentary On Deuteronomy (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895), pp. 251, 280.

<sup>2</sup>What is being considered here is the meaning of Dt. 25:4 in its present structure and context and how it



be given his just due.

The image of the ox, then, was used as the illustrative vehicle for conveying this principle along the line of minor to major argument. If a lowly ox has inalienable rights how much more would fellow Israelites.

The NT context is a series of questions and challenges centering on the basic exercise (or lack of it) of Paul's authority as an Apostle. The final question preceding the quotation was whether Paul was simply speaking in human thoughts or with the authority of God. In answer, Paul brought to bear the weight of the Law. The subsequent context implies that Paul did have a right for support and that the quotation, as explained in vss 9b-10, established positive answers to his questions in vss 4-5.

### Hermeneutical

The general trend of opinion regarding this quotation is that Paul has not only openly ignored (vss 9b-10) the literal meaning of the OT<sup>1</sup> but, in fact, he has claimed that it was never there in the first place!

---

may relate to both agricultural and human activity. If the passage had a pre-Scriptural history relating only to animal humaneness the question is, has its meaning been altered by its present context? Did the one who placed it in its present context have more than oxen on his mind? Unless one feels compelled to hypothesize a gloss or rather erratic editorial arrangement, the context itself, contributes significantly to the intentional connotation of the verse.

<sup>1</sup>Thackeray, SPJT, p. 193.

Higgins writes:

Paul denies the literal meaning of the passage he is quoting (Deut. xxv, 4), which is an example of the humanitarianism of Deuteronomy, and uses it to prove that the (spiritual) labourer is worthy of his (material) hire.<sup>1</sup>

This is written in reference to 1 Cor. 9:5-11 to which Riesenfeld's remarks are pertinent:

Dans cette phrase, ou en tout cas dans son premier membre, le langage allégorique n'est pas fait d'images spontanées, mais présuppose un usage courant de ces métaphores dans la terminologie commune à l'auteur et à ceux auxquels il s'adresse.<sup>2</sup>

The formal presentation of the quote presupposes such a tradition as do Paul's interpretive remarks which follow. It is well to hold that Paul was communicating in known terms and was not relating one unknown to another.<sup>3</sup> Bruce<sup>4</sup> takes the "oxen-only" approach in Deuteronomy when he writes that Paul's "argument may clash with modern exegetical method and western sentiment, but he must be allowed to mean what he says."

Many commentators conclude that Paul adopted an allegorical interpretation. One author suggests that Paul may have been writing playfully but sees the effect

---

<sup>1</sup>Higgins, CSOT, p. 115.

<sup>2</sup>Riesenfeld, LTP, p. 49. See also Herbert M. Gale, The Use Of Analogy In The Letters Of Paul (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), p. 102.

<sup>3</sup>Johannes Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1925), p. 237, writes that this is "Deutung noch einer Begründung aus einem allgemeinen Lebensgesetz."

<sup>4</sup>Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 84.

of later Rabbinical allegory if Paul was serious.<sup>1</sup>

James Barr goes further and asserts that the legal text is quoted "which has no event correspondences in it at all; and the literal and original sense is explicitly repudiated by the apostle."<sup>2</sup>

But the conclusion that Paul had indulged in allegory is not inescapable<sup>3</sup> although Hanson would assert that Paul was not "deliberately designing an allegorical use of the text."<sup>4</sup> An analogical use is more suitable for Paul's conceptuality, especially in view of the OT context.<sup>5</sup> Robertson<sup>6</sup> writes that Paul did not allegorize,

<sup>1</sup>Sir George Adam Smith, The Book of Deuteronomy (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1918), p. 286. Gerhardsson, MM, p. 317, claims Paul used it allegorically because he could not use it as straightforward law. Knox, SPCJ, p. 127, calls this a method of "explaining away the details of the Law by the introduction of a moral allegory . . . ." But does this also apply to Josephus who (Jew. Ant IV sec 233) uses Dt. 25:4 regarding oxen but in a context of sharing with those in need such as poor, beasts, wayfarers?

<sup>2</sup>James Barr, Old and New in Interpretation (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1966), p. 109. Bonsirven, EREP, pp. 329-30, notes that with this use of the OT text one has arrived at the extreme limits of typology.

<sup>3</sup>As against Weiss, 1 Kor., p. 236, "Hier liegt die vollausgebildete allegor. methode . . . .", and others. Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 183, writes that for Paul even "die Detailvorschriften des Gesetzes allegorisch auszulegen sind."

<sup>4</sup>Hanson, SPTT, p. 166.      <sup>5</sup>Hanson, SPTT, p. 166.

<sup>6</sup>Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 184. Also H. Cunliffe-Jones, Deuteronomy (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1951), p. 140 and Clemen, GAT, pp. 194-95, who refers to Ro. 8:19ff.

that is, ignore the historical meaning, but asserted "that the prohibition had a higher significance, in comparison with which the literal purport of it was of small moment." This higher significance was based on the presupposition that God speaks to the church from the OT and thus, in this OT passage, has found God's word for the community.<sup>1</sup> This should be related to the concept of minor to major argument. Paul stands in contrast to the apologetic allegorizing of Philo while others see Paul in the same tradition and using the same motivation as Philo.<sup>2</sup> Philo<sup>3</sup> noted that the Law was concerned only with lofty things but this does not deny that the Law lacks mention of mundane things or unreasoning creatures. In De Virt. 145 Philo noted the mark of the Law's humanity by these prescriptions about oxen and other animals. It is to be doubted if Paul was motivated to avoid associating the Law with mundane items as was Philo.<sup>4</sup>

However, if one sees that the Dt. 25:4 itself is a principle which in its present context has a primary significance for human as well as livestock relationships then Paul has neither violated the historical context nor

---

<sup>1</sup>Wendland, Kor., p. 64.

<sup>2</sup>Moffatt, 1 Cor., pp. 116-17; Weiss, 1 Kor., p. 236; Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 183.

<sup>3</sup>De Specialibus Legibus I, 260.

<sup>4</sup>Hanson, SPTT, p. 165. See also Somn. I 231ff for Philo's concern for the literal meaning of the Law.

indulged in extreme typology. When Hanson notes that Paul has used other allegories in vss 7-10 he sees that they, like the ox, "are only valid if they are understood literally in the first place,"<sup>1</sup> A literal meaning, however, is not a wooden-headed understanding of bare word-forms but of the intention of the literary style. For example, when the Psalmist said of Yahweh "He shall cover thee with his feathers, and under his wings shalt thou trust," Psalm 91:4, he was not saying that God was a giant bird. Even though that example is drawn from poetry, where figures of speech are more commonly expected, it well illustrates the nature of what the "literal" sense may be in figurative language. The intended meaning of Psalm 91:4 would be that God will protect and comfort His own.<sup>2</sup> Paul was asserting that the intended sense of Deut. 25:4 was that the one who worked has a right to eat of his labor. This fits inherently well into both the context of Deut. 25 and with later Rabbinical usage.

When the Rabbis used Deut. 25:4 "it was very freely applied in an analogical sense, though no rabbi suggests that the literal meaning can be ignored."<sup>3</sup> This

---

<sup>1</sup>Hanson, SPTT, p. 161-62.

<sup>2</sup>Dt. 6:8 is another passage whose intent was something quite other than the actual wearing of a physical box on the forehead.

<sup>3</sup>Hanson, SPTT, p. 164.

literal sense is seen in MR.<sup>1</sup> If Paul adopted a currently held interpretation of this passage it will not do to term it allegorical without being absolutely positive that its original intent was limited to the well-being of oxen alone. Smith<sup>2</sup> calls this "a clear case of kindness to animals" typical to Dt. Gerhard von Rad<sup>3</sup> notes that its Sitz im Leben will be found "in dem alten Sippenethos." G. Meredith Kline, on the contrary, writes regarding the OT passage:

The positive counterpart to the prohibition of dishonouring a man in spite of his evil works is the requirement that he receive all proper honor for his good works. This verse, probably a proverbial expression, seems even here to have the force given it by Paul in 1 Corinthians 9:9 and 1 Timothy 5:18.<sup>4</sup>

One does not need to go as far as Barrett, however, and assert:

The only interpretation that is not forced is that in the Old Testament law God had in mind not oxen, but Christian preachers and their needs.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>MR, Num., p. 335 and SS, p. 255, quotes Dt. 25:4 as an example of how Israel was to be different from the other nations, thus referring to oxen in a literal manner. In MR, Num., p. 705, the passage shows how God had included every earthly thing in His Torah. Onkelos remains close to the Hebrew.

<sup>2</sup>Smith, Deut., pp. 285-86.

<sup>3</sup>Gerhard von Rad, Das fünfte Buch Mose (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), p. 110.

<sup>4</sup>G. Meredith Kline, Treaty Of The Great King (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1963), p. 117. Johnson, QNTD, p. 259, also asserts that the OT precept itself was typical in nature.

<sup>5</sup>Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 205.

This appreciation of the nature of principle and figurative language in Scripture seems a bit too rigid. One would not, for example, take it that the events recalled in Ro. 15:4 and 1 Cor. 10:11 only happened as examples for Christians in the First Century A.D. They happened for many reasons and for the benefit of many times and peoples. When Paul applied a principle he was not primarily concerned with the past or future applications but rather with the case at hand. So it was with Paul here. Deut. 25:4 was not simply written for Christian preachers in the <sup>sixth</sup> decade of the First Century but they could and were certainly included in its application. Here again the OT was used as authority for Christian piety.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Biörn Fjörstedt, Synoptic Tradition In 1 Corinthians (Stockholm: Rotobekman, 1974), p. 76ff, shows the affinities of Luke 10 with 1 Cor. 9. The Dt. 25:4 quotation is not examined, however. Fjörstedt is convinced that Paul shows signs of synoptic influence.



DEUTERONOMY 32:17, 1 CORINTHIANS 10:20Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
		ἀλλ'
		ὅτι
		ἃ
יזבח	ἔθυσαν	θύουσιν
לשד	δαιμονίοις	δαιμονίοις
	καί	καί
ל	οὐ	οὐ
לה	θεῶ	θεῶ
		θύουσιν

Masoretic Variants

BHK lists no variants for this section.

Septuagintal Variants

The Chester Beatty Papyri have a lacuna at Dt. 32:17. B-M note that in the Old Latin the translation of ἐθυσαν is preceded by et. Justin omits καὶ - θεῶ.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that the second θύουσιν is supported by  $\kappa$  A B C D E F G P 17 37 46 73 137. <sup>for the first and second θύουσιν</sup>  $\theta\upsilon\epsilon\iota_{\lambda}$  is read by K L and <sup>due to the addition of τὰ ἑῶν after the first θύουσιν,\*</sup> most others.  $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\text{ou}$  (F  $\text{ουχ}$ )  $\theta\epsilon\omega$  is as above in <sup>A</sup>  $\kappa_{\lambda}$  B C P and others while it is after the second θύουσιν in D E F G K L <sup>al pler</sup> and d e f g vg syr<sup>utr</sup> sah cop, etc.

\* cf. XACK(L) al omn<sup>vid</sup> and many versional and patristic witnesses.

Textual

The phrase δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῷ is taken verbatim from the LXX. Paul has changed the tense of θύω and placed it at the end of the quotation. Because Paul had integrated the passage into his context, supplying no IF, this might be passed over as an allusion rather than a quotation. This is, however, the only place in the NT where θύω and δαίμων are connected. While this is not a formal citation it does however agree with the Hebrew and LXX of Dt. 32:17.

Contextual

The OT context is the "Song of Moses" where the writer envisaged the failures of Israel's history. Paul had continued his argument against idolatry and entered into his conclusion.<sup>1</sup> The readers' attention is turned in vs 18 to "Israel according to the flesh," to show how the priests had a share in the altar according to the same principle as does the Christian in his Eucharist. Vss 19-20 show Paul's intent. He looked beyond the elements of ritual to the spiritual object of worship. For the Jew it was Yahweh, for the Christian it was Christ, but for the idolator it is the world of demons.

---

<sup>1</sup>διόπερ, 1 Cor. 10:14.

## Hermeneutical

Midrash Rabbah<sup>1</sup> notes regarding the "satyrs" that "these satyrs are nought but demons, as is borne out by the text which says, they sacrificed unto demons, no-gods."<sup>2</sup>

What is striking in Paul's use of the OT in this case is his resorting to OT language and concepts to describe contemporary Gentile events. The entire section of 1 Cor. 10:14-21 seems to be a Christian midrash on Deut. 32:17-21.<sup>3</sup> Without denying or distorting the OT event of Israel's idolatry in the wilderness Paul has drawn an application to the events of Corinthian idolatry.

---

<sup>1</sup>MR Lev. 17:7, p. 287.

<sup>2</sup>Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 216, also translates οὐ θεῶν of 1 Cor. 10:20 as "no-god" rather than "not to God." Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 205, n. 36, decides for "not to God." See Dt. 32:21 for the use of no-god. NEB "no-gods," Jerome Bible "not-god," and NASV "not-god." Δαιμόνιον is more abstract than δαίμων; Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 235. Werner Foerster, "δαίμων," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament II (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), p. 2, writes that δαίμων is "less precise than θεός." It is best defined as a "super-natural power" or lesser deity. It is difficult to know if δαίμων in Dt. 32:17 is "used contemptuously of idols or of real demons," Foerster, TDNT II, p. 11. δαίμων originally signified a type of supernatural being, inferior to the gods proper, Toy, QNT, p. 174. Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, Charles A. Briggs, A Hebrew And English Lexicon Of The Old Testament (Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1968), p. 993, give δαίμων an apparent meaning of "demon" as a loanword from Assyrian "sêdu, a protecting spirit, esp. of bull-colossus." Onkelos goes its own interpretive way: "they sacrificed to demons in whom there is no help (nothing that is needed)," Etheridge, TOJ, II, Dt. 32:17. Cf. Acts 19:26, Gal. 4:8.

<sup>3</sup>Hanson, STPP, p. 115.

He was able to use the third person plural of the quotation of Deut. 32:17 which related to Israel to apply to the idolators in Corinth and, in a more general sense, to idolatry world-wide. Paul's sense of OT history was not distorted (i.e. allegorized) by his method of drawing a principle.

## JOB, PSALMS, PROVERBS

## JOB

JOB 5:13 AND PSALM 94:11 (93:11 LXX),1 CORINTHIANS 3:19-20Textual DisplayJob 5:13MTLXXNT

γέγραπται

γάρ

ὁ

טכל

ὁ

καταλαμβάνων

δρασσόμενος

τούς

ם'מכה

σοφούς

σοφούς

έν

έν

תה

תה

םהגב

φρονήσει

πανουργία

αὐτῶν

Psa. 94:11MTLXXNT

καί

πάλιν

יהי

κύριος

κύριος

גדי

γινώσκει

γινώσκει

τούς

τούς

השמה

διαλογισμούς

διαλογισμούς

Psa. 94:11 (cont.)

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
	τῶν	τῶν
םדא	ἀνθρώπων	σοφῶν
- כי	ὅτι	ὅτι
הה	εἰσὶν	εἰσὶν
הבל	μάταιοι	μάταιοι

Masoretic VariantsJob

BHK lists a variant reading of the masculine plural suffix of **בערמם**. A medieval Hebrew MS 89 in Kennicott, *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. 2, 1780, reads **הערמה** which is also read by B and א.<sup>1</sup>

Psalms

BHS offers no variants.

Septuagintal VariantsJob

Swete notes that A adds αὐτῶν after φρονήσει in accord with the masculine plural suffix of the Hebrew. Holmes and Parsons note that for καταλαμβάνων Chrysostom

---

<sup>1</sup>Brown, Driver, Briggs, BDB, p. 791, note that **בערמם** may possibly be from **ערמה** but gives **ערמ** as the n.m. form which is represented in Job 5:13. William Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, ed. E. Kautzsch, ed. and trans., A. E. Cowley (Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1898), p. 267, section 91<sup>e</sup>, notes that with feminines, the Masora may possibly regard **ם** as a shortening of **ה** in the **כהנונה** of Hos. 13:2 and **בערמם** in Job 5:13.

reads καταλαμβάνει κυριος. He adds τους to σοφους, omits τῷ<sup>η</sup> before φρονήσει and adds αυτων after. 254 (a Vatican codex #337 of the 13th cen.) adds αυτων.

### Psalms

Neither Swete nor the GLXX list any variants for this passage.

### New Testament Variants

#### 1 Cor. 3:19

Tischendorf lists no variants for this passage.

#### 1 Cor. 3:20

Tischendorf lists no variants. Nestle notes that 3 33 614 and a great number of late witnesses read ανθρωπων for σοφων which seems to be a harmonization to the LXX.

### Textual

#### Job

The syntax is nearly identical with A, the only alteration being Paul's addition of the accusative plural article before σοφούς. The word correspondence is less marked in the Pauline version of δρασσόμενος for καταλαμβάνων and πανουργία for φρονήσει. This substitution has caused many scholars to view this quotation as a direct translation from the Hebrew.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Turpie, OTN, p. 24. Robertson, 1 Cor., pp. 70-71, also sees it to be nearer to the Hebrew. Lightfoot sees the substitution of the more correct and forcible term πανουργία for πργ, NEP, p. 195. See also



Ellis asserts that when Paul varies from the Alexandrian text he "reflects the Hebrew because no LXX translation was available to him."<sup>1</sup> Elsewhere he states that "Paul's citations from Job (Rom. 11.35; 1 Cor. 3.19) may follow the Hebrew simply because it is the most familiar text."<sup>2</sup> One wonders why Paul, who once moved in the highest circles of Jerusalem Jewry, would never have had access to a Greek version of Job<sup>3</sup> and why, when he so consistently favors the LXX version, he would be more familiar with one book, Job, in Hebrew.<sup>4</sup> Neither Philo

---

Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 99.

<sup>1</sup>Ellis, PUOT, p. 4.      <sup>2</sup>Ellis, PUOT, p. 144.

<sup>3</sup>The LXX of Job was known to Philo and was therefore in existence in Paul's day. C. H. Dodd, The Bible And The Greeks (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935), p. 15, n. 1.

<sup>4</sup>Toy, QNT, p. 172, offers a more likely possibility when he thinks that this quotation probably came "from an Aramaic version, which was nearer the Hebrew than is our Septuagint text; not, however, because it was a more accurate rendering (for he often follows an incorrect translation of the Septuagint), but probably because this proverbial expression was familiar to him in its Aramaic form." Unfortunately, 11Qtg Job starts at 17:14 and has a lacuna from 40:31 to 41:7 which also excludes comparison with the Romans 11:35 quotation of Job 41:3. This Targum, dated pre-70 by J. Van Der Ploeg, Le Targum De Job De La Grotto 11 De Qumran (Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1962), p. 6, has a text which approaches the MT, p. 11, but its priority to Onkelos and Jonathan makes it a potentially important witness. See also Donald H. Gard, The Exegetical Method Of The Greek Translator Of The Book Of Job (Philadelphia: Society Of Biblical Literature, 1952), p. 1, regarding an MT vorlage for the Targum of Job and J. A. Sanders, "Cave 11 Surprises And The Question Of Canon," from The Canon And Masorah Of The Hebrew Bible, ed. Sid Z. Leiman (New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1974), pp. 37-38, who concludes that the Targum is in reality a simple Aramaic translation.

nor Qumran offer any textual evidence on this passage. There is strong evidence that Paul quoted from a Greek text, however.

Καταλαμβάνω translates eighteen different Hebrew words.<sup>1</sup> Δράσσεσθαι translates קָשַׁב and יָמַר<sup>2</sup> and is found in Lev. 2:2; 5:12; Jud. 5:26; 13:7 and Psa. 2:12. The two Greek words do not overlap in translating any Hebrew word, therefore the latter is not born of a mainstream LXX pattern of translation. However, φρονήσει translates חָכְמָה only in Job 5:13.<sup>3</sup> Πανουργία is only translated by חֲסִידָה in the LXX,<sup>4</sup> therefore Paul's use is within the semantic range of LXX expression. Not only this, but Paul's use of πανουργία (πργ) follows a Theodotionic pattern elsewhere.<sup>5</sup> LXX Job is well known for its freedom from the Hebrew and paraphrasing tendencies.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, A Concordance To The Septuagint And The Other Greek Versions Of The Old Testament I (Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954), p. 735.

<sup>2</sup>H&R I, p. 348.

<sup>3</sup>H&R II, p. 1439.

<sup>4</sup>H&R II, p. 1053; Nu. 24:22; Josh. 9:4; Prov. 1:4; 8:5.

<sup>5</sup>Ellis, PUOT, p. 15, n. 4.

<sup>6</sup>Gillis Gerleman, Studies In The Septuagint. I. Book Of Job (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1946), p. 17. See also Henry Gehman, "The Theological Approach Of The Greek Translator Of Job 1-15," Journal of Biblical Literature 68 (1949), pp. 231-40, who cautions that extreme literalism and paraphrase may be found side by side in the same verse and shows the unconscious but pervasive theological bias which colors the translation.

Orlinsky has shown<sup>1</sup> that when Greek Job appears to show a non-MT basis three possibilities exist; one, the translator of Job may have rendered the Hebrew interpretively. Two, the Greek itself may be corrupt. Three, there may be a legitimate non-MT basis. Concerning the passage under consideration there is no Hebrew MSS evidence, from the Dead sea area, for example, to support the idea of a non-MT reading. Secondly, there is no evidence that the Greek of the LXX or Paul is corrupt. Therefore it seems that Paul has used a translation which differed from the main LXX tradition but which, in fact, provided a better translation of the Hebrew. Because this is not an ad hoc translation it must represent a first century text. Thus, when Paul seems to correct the LXX after the Hebrew, as in this case, another Greek version was being used.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Harry M. Orlinsky, "Studies In The Septuagint Of The Book Of Job," Hebrew Union College Annual 35 (1964), p. 51.

<sup>2</sup>Bonsirven, EREP, pp. 325-26. Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 94; and Héring, 1 Cor., p. 25, also commend this view. L. Cerfaux, "Vestiges D'Un Florilège Dans I Cor., I, 18-III, 24?," Revue D'Histoire Ecclésiastique 27 (1931), p. 528, does not think Paul was responsible for the change of καταλαμβάνων to δρασσόμενος. Stendahl, SSM, p. 173, also sees an unknown Greek version behind the quotation. Henry St. John Thackeray, The Relation Of St. Paul To Contemporary Jewish Thought (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1900), p. 53, n. 3, relates ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτῶν to 2 Cor. 11:3 ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτοῦ which he claims is Paul's equivalent for the φρονιμώτατος of Gen. 3:1. He notes the similar sense found in the Jerusalem Targum I on Gen. 3:13 and wonders if Paul had ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτοῦ in his text. Thackeray is convinced that Paul did not make an independent rendering

### Psalms

The only variation from the LXX is Paul's substitution of σοφῶν for ἀνθρώπων. This substitution has no Greek or Hebrew MSS evidence and must, at present, be attributed to hermeneutical alteration.<sup>1</sup>

### Contextual

#### Job

The OT context centers on the first response given to Job by Eliphaz. He teaches that Job is being reproved for sin and that he should submit to and profit from such reproof.<sup>2</sup> The specific context, the prelude to Eliphaz's exhortation of vs 17, concerns how God would lift up the lowly and confound the evil doer.

#### Psalms

Psalms 94 is an imprecation against the enemies of God. The wicked are described in vss 1-6. Verse 7 supplies insight into the thoughts of the wicked and also acts as the basis for vss 8-11. In response to the

---

of the LXX but had a widely divergent LXX text, p. 181. Ellis, PUOT, p. 15, n. 4, has shown that "Paul's use of πανουργία (παρ) in 1 Cor. 3:19 as contrasted with the LXX's φρονησίς also agrees with Theodotion's translation of ארע in other places." In MR Ex., p. 365, Job 5:13 is quoted regarding Abraham being caught up in his own sin and in MR Num., p. 759, as a thought of Moses as he was deciding in Dt. 19:9 whether or not to strike the rock.

<sup>1</sup>See Ro. 15:10-12 for a three-fold use of καὶ πάλιν as an IF.

<sup>2</sup>Job 5:17-21.

accusation that the God of Israel does not pay heed, the wrong doers are themselves told to pay heed and realize the true identity of the God they are mocking. God, who made the ear and eye, hears and sees better than they. In contrast with the One who is the source of knowledge, man's thoughts are like a vapor.

In the first part of Chapter 3 Paul had shown that the Corinthians were unable to receive the teaching of the mature due to their factious spirit. This spirit was especially ill-grounded because the human objects of boasting were, in fact, unified in their efforts<sup>1</sup> so the distinctions were superfluous. Verses 10-17 are a double-edged parenthesis to those who pervert the teaching begun by Paul.<sup>2</sup>

In vss 18-23, Paul's argument against becoming taken up with the wisdom of the world was being drawn to

---

<sup>1</sup>1 Cor. 3:8.

<sup>2</sup>J. Massyngberde Ford, "You Are God's 'Sukkah,' 1 Cor. 3:10-17," New Testament Studies 21 (1974), trying to see a Sukkah or Temple imagery throughout 1 Cor. 3, attempts to place the wood, hay and stubble and precious metal imagery within the Temple context and, as a result, finds them inappropriate. She concludes that they are more appropriate to the "Sukkah" of Israel as described in the Mishnah and Talmud (see her pp. 139-40 for the rabbinic evidence). But this imagery was not intended to be included in Temple imagery in the first place. Ford's assertion, p. 140, that Paul's *ναός* rather than *ἱερόν* may signify "any shrine" misses Paul's point of *ναός* as the inner place of the Spirit in the believer. The conclusion that the purging fire of 1 Cor. 3:13-15 represents the light ceremony of the feast of tabernacles is stretched too far beyond Paul's context and intentions.

a close. He had shown how the Corinthians' immaturity had kept them from understanding the nature of God's work and had moved them away from the foundation of their faith. They were the temple of God, and should therefore understand all their attendant responsibilities. Verse 18 begins Paul's summary exhortation that the wise of this age should become foolish; that is to say, paradoxically, truly wise by God's standards. The quotations of vss 19 and 20 are followed by the exhortation not to boast in men with an added encouragement that in Christ all belonged to them, hence no need to seek security or partisan favor in men should arise.

### Hermeneutical

#### Job

Because the OT quote was concerned with God's confounding of the wise and elevation of the humble, it was quite appropriate to Paul's thoughts in 1 Cor. 3. If it be concluded that Paul<sup>av</sup> made a direct translation from the Hebrew then the final citation is certainly more powerful in sense than the LXX. Δρασσόμενος is a stronger verb than καταλαμβάνω and πανουργία is a "more perjorative word" than φρονήσει.<sup>1</sup> If a now lost non-LXX Greek Job be rejected, a possible reason for the presence of πανουργία is that Paul substituted, by memory or deliberation, the word from the πανούργων from the preceding

---

<sup>1</sup>Héring, 1 Cor., p. 25.



verse in Greek Job 5:12.

Though the IF, γέγραπται γάρ, does not have the function of quotation marks to introduce a verbally accurate citation of a standard text, its point is centered on stating the authoritative source of the citation followed by the sense of the quotation in varying degrees of fidelity to the textual particulars.<sup>1</sup> Paul held that the God whose characteristics were displayed in Job was the same as the God of the Corinthians. This passage displays a continuity of deity and piety from the OT Scriptures.

#### Psalms

This quotation forms part of a meditation on wisdom placed παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, vs 19a. Thus the OT context is consonant with Paul's usage of the quotation. If man's thoughts were like breath before God, why persist in clinging to the wisdom ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, vs 18? The conclusion of vs 21 followed quite naturally: one should not boast in the things of men.

The substitution of σοφῶν becomes clear when one compares it with the previous quotation of 1 Cor. 3:19 which uses σοφούς. Paul conformed his text to the situation at hand by making specific the more general ἀνθρώπων

---

<sup>1</sup>Herbert Edward Ryle, Philo And Holy Scripture (London: Macmillan And Co., 1895), pp. xxxvii-xlv. This is the general pattern followed by Philo as well. This and Paul's quotation in 1 Cor. 2:9 are not complete sentences and are not integrated into their surrounding syntax.



in the light of his argument.<sup>1</sup> Turpie writes that "in other words, what in the Hebrew is stated to belong to the body-general, is in the New Testament made applicable to a part particular, and that to the more unlikely part."<sup>2</sup> This could be a memory lapse but, most likely, is a purposeful alteration to advance and support the argument.<sup>3</sup>

On the other hand, Héring calls this a curious divergence from the LXX text and from the MT.<sup>4</sup> He notes that the "method of changing the traditional text is not a habit of his"<sup>5</sup> and accepts ἀνθρώπων as the original thus making σοφῶν a correction by a copyist who was influenced by the σοφός and σοφία of vss 18-19. It is difficult to reason why an early copyist would make a change of Paul's text away from the LXX simply to supposedly enhance Paul's argument. More probably an editor would make the kind of change exhibited in 3, 33 and 614 where the text is changed to conform to the LXX. Therefore Paul made the change himself to fit his own argument. The problem with which Héring wrestles disappears when one realizes that Paul was not bound to modern conceptions of

---

<sup>1</sup>Robertson, 1 Cor., p. liii, Moffatt, 1 Cor., p. 43.

<sup>2</sup>Turpie, OTN, p. 34.

<sup>3</sup>Toy, QNT, pp. 172-73; Ellis, PUOT, p. 14; Hanson, SPTT, p. 147 and Bonsirven, EREP, p. 331, agree as well.

<sup>4</sup>Héring, 1 Cor., p. 25. <sup>5</sup>Héring, 1 Cor., p. 25.

precise quotation.<sup>1</sup> Also, it is inaccurate to say that changing the traditional text was not a Pauline habit. For Paul, such a change would carry no sinister connotation and would conform to the common midrashic patterns of his day. Johnson writes:

It should be observed, therefore, that verbal exactness in quoting is a habit only recently introduced in literature. It was impossible, in effect, before the invention of printing made books abundant and the construction of indexes and concordances rendered it easy to find any passage at will. It has prevailed especially since the invention of quotation marks, which seem to call attention to the very words, and even letters, and to certify their correctness. Yet even to-day it is far from universal; and in the age of the apostles centuries were to elapse before it should be thought of by any one.<sup>2</sup>

Even memory lapse should be considered before conjecturing that  $\sigma\sigma\phi\omega\nu$  is a later editorial emendation. In this case the harder reading should be accepted as prior. It must be noted, however, that the powers of memory, especially in a cultivated Jew such as Paul, could be quite phenomenal.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, while the halakic and haggadic midrashim of Paul's day would not be under the present-day conceptions of quotation, such exegesis depended on a minute preservation of the text<sup>4</sup> and it is not accurate

---

<sup>1</sup>See Johnson, QNTO, chapter II "Quotations From Memory," pp. 29-61 for extensive treatments of quotations from Philo up to the Fathers.

<sup>2</sup>Johnson, QNTO, p. 29.

<sup>3</sup>Gerhardsson, MM, p. 40, 89f.

<sup>4</sup>Gerhardsson, MM, pp. 40-41.

to describe a given variant as an arbitrary deviation from the text.

Héring<sup>1</sup> also seems to resist the use of the general Psalm passage in a more particular way by Paul. This is not undemonstrable in one other instance of Psalm quotation<sup>2</sup> and should present no problem here in light of the midrashic tendencies of the apostle. The textual evidence supporting Héring's contention is also not convincing. He writes that ἀνθρώπων is "attested by a number of minuscules, the Armenian version, as well as by Marcion (according to Epiphanius, Haer. 42, MPG XLI, col. 724B, etc., 781A)."<sup>3</sup>

Grosheide<sup>4</sup> finds that the change of "man" to "wise" is "a remarkable modification" and asserts that Paul made the Psalm text into a proof-text. A text becomes a proof-text in a negative sense when it is used without accuracy to its original context and when its original historical sense means something quite different. Current examples such as "a little child shall lead them," Isa. 11:6, used with reference to adults following the wise advice of babes or an assertion that "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers," 2 Cor. 6:14, refers to the marriage of a believer with an unbeliever

---

<sup>1</sup>Héring, 1 Cor., p. 25.

<sup>2</sup>Eph. 4:8.

<sup>3</sup>Héring, 1 Cor., p. 25, n. 7.

<sup>4</sup>Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 93.

well illustrate the vagaries of proof-texting. Paul does not here violate the essential historical understanding of the OT text nor apply it to a situation beyond its limits.<sup>1</sup> Here is what already has been seen in 1 Cor. 2:16; the application of a general principle to a specific situation. Newness is always inherent in application otherwise all one merely accomplishes is restatement. The newness of this particular application is its focus on a specific group, the wise, yet the theological and historical connections of the OT source are neither denied nor invalidated.

---

<sup>1</sup>Thomas Randolph, The Prophecies, And The Texts, Cited In The New Testament, Compared With The Hebrew Original And With The Septuagint Version (Oxford: J. and J. Fletcher, 1782), p. 40. Robertson, 1 Cor., p. liii, asserts that "the Psalm contrasts the designs of men with the designs of God, and therefore the idea of σοφός is in the context."

## PSALMS

PSALM 8:6 (8:7 LXX & MT), 1 CORINTHIANS 15:27Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
כ	πάντα	πάντα
		γάρ
ההש	ὑπέταξας	ὑπέταξεν
-הנה	ὑποκάτω	ὑπό
	τῶν	τούς
וילגו	ποδῶν	πόδας
	αὐτοῦ	αὐτοῦ

Eph. 1:22: . . . καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοῖς πόδας  
αὐτοῦ . . . .

Heb. 2:8: . . . πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ.

Masoretic Variants

BHS offers no variants for this section.

Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX apparatus shows that the Sahidic and Syriac of Paul of Tella read τα before παντα.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf supplies no variants to this section.

Textual

Other than changes resulting from Paul recording

"in the historical mode,"<sup>1</sup> the textual differences relate to a change from adverb to preposition (ὑποκάτω to ὑπό) with the resultant alteration of the case of τῶν ποδῶν. Psalms 110:1 and 8:7 are combined in Eph. 1:20-22 and appear in Heb. 1:13; 2:8. ὑπό does not translate נחל in Greek OT.<sup>2</sup>

### Contextual

Psalm 8 speaks of the praiseworthiness of God as Creator and of the inherent dignity which God gave to humanity by placing man over His creation. The Corinthian context continues the proofs that Christ must presently reign until he subjects all of His enemies.<sup>3</sup>

### Hermeneutical

It is a well-known fact that while the Psalmist speaks of mankind in general, Paul, like the writer to Hebrews, made this a primary reference to Christ.<sup>4</sup> More specifically, this OT passage was used "to express the implications of the Lordship of the risen Christ."<sup>5</sup> Psalm 8 was also used in wider application to refer to

---

<sup>1</sup>Turpie, QTN, p. 35.

<sup>2</sup>With the doubtful exception of a questionable reading of Sirach 16:15; H&R sup., p. 194.

<sup>3</sup>In Hebrews, the Psalm also refers to the enthronement of Christ. See Thomas, LXX in Heb., p. 37.

<sup>4</sup>See Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 147; Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 368.

<sup>5</sup>Lindars, NTA, p. 168.

Christ's priority in the new creation.<sup>1</sup> The key-word πάντα relates this passage with the preceding quotation. Because the messianic sense of Psalm 8 was current in Paul's day,<sup>2</sup> Paul shared in a tradition which, while perhaps not based on a collection of written testimonies, was sourced in the Messianic speculations of Judaism and later adopted by the early Church.<sup>3</sup> This adoption, as with most other OT passages, was made according to the fundamental hermeneutical paradigm of the identification of the Messiah with Jesus of Nazareth.

Paul was speaking against a position which denied a future resurrection<sup>4</sup> and implied that hope in Christ was a matter for this life alone.<sup>5</sup> Verses 20-28 were written to refute the denial of a future resurrection and to explain the delay of glorification by describing what was taking place behind the scenes, so to speak. A process of subjection was occurring during which Christ, reigning at the right hand of the Father, was systematically subduing His enemies.<sup>6</sup> All this was being done according to a unique order (τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι).<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Wendland, Kor., p. 129.

<sup>2</sup>Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 325.

<sup>3</sup>Brevard S. Childs, "Psalm 8 In The Context Of The Christian Canon," Interpretation 23 (1969), passim, discusses the Psalm as treated within the entire canon as its context. This is a most interesting exposition of OT and NT concepts though Child's purpose is to produce edification rather than to investigate and produce contextual-descriptive results.

<sup>4</sup>vs 12.    <sup>5</sup>vs 19.    <sup>6</sup>vs 27.    <sup>7</sup>vs 23.



PSALM 24:1 (23:1 LXX), 1 CORINTHIANS 10:26Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
	τοῦ	τοῦ
ליהוה	κυρίου	κυρίου
		γάρ
	ἡ	ἡ
הארץ	γῆ	γῆ
	καί	καί
	τό	τό
ומלואה	πλήρωμα	πλήρωμα
	αὐτῆς	αὐτῆς

Masoretic Variants

BHS lists no variants for this section.

Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX lists no variants for this section.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that του κυριου γαρ is read by  
 א B C D E F G while A H K L P read του γαρ κυριου.

The entire quotation is read  
 after the συνειδησιν of 1 Cor. 10:28 in H<sup>44</sup> KL al longe plu syr<sup>p</sup> go  
 Chr<sup>258</sup> (et. com) Euthal<sup>104</sup> (sed του κυριου γαρ etc) Thdrt Phot ap Dec et ipso Dec Thplyl (hi  
 omnes explicant in com m).

Textual

Paul made a direct quote of the LXX and inserted

only the postpositive γάρ as an IF.

### Contextual

The Psalm is one of praise to the Lord who owns the earth by virtue of His creative and sovereign powers. It is a dazzling processional of the entrance of the victorious king of glory (וַיָּבֹאוּ מֶלֶךְ). Paul placed this quotation in the context of what was proper to eat regarding meat sacrificed to idols and how one related to fellow Christians who did not feel such food was appropriate to eat. Paul had returned to the πάντα ἔξουσιν theme of 6:12. In the latter passage Paul emphasized bodily self-control by the addition of ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγὼ ἐξουσιασθήσομαι. In the former he stressed the need for concern for corporate edification by adding ἀλλ' οὐ πάντα οἰκοδομεῖ to the πάντα ἔξουσιν phrase.

### Hermeneutical

The quotation was designed to supply the basis for one's confidence in eating any meat and not asking regarding the nature of the food one bought at the market.<sup>1</sup> A preliminary reason for concern over such matters was given in vs 25b: διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν. The conscience was that of the weaker brother.<sup>2</sup> The fundamental reason for the disregard of the prior use of meat was supplied

---

<sup>1</sup>Toy, QNT, p. 175; Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 220.

<sup>2</sup>vs 29.

by the principle of the quotation: all is the Lord's; that is, by virtue of His creative powers all food is inherently good. This application of the Psalm cut against the grain of Jewish halakah on the eating of meats.<sup>1</sup> Peter's reluctance to eat the food offered him by a vision in Acts 10 is symbolic of the insight soon to come that God was no respecter of persons.<sup>2</sup> It does not appear, however, that the vision was also applied to the meats themselves.<sup>3</sup> But there is no indication that Paul was advocating the eating of unclean meats because the meat offered to idols may well have been from kosher meats. The Psalm, as used in this context, only supported the context that a Christian was free to eat the meat previously offered to idols. Paul was dealing with an essentially Gentile, rather than Jewish, problem.

This sense of the goodness of creation was inherent in the Psalm's context and was adopted by Paul. Such a use would have been familiar to Jewish readers as a context for joy and thanksgiving.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Eduard Lohse, "Zu 1 Cor. 10:26.31," Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 47 (1956), p. 279.

<sup>2</sup>Acts 10:34.

<sup>3</sup>Gal. 2:11-14.

<sup>4</sup>Tamid 7:4, Danby Mishnah, p. 589. In Tosefta B<sup>e</sup>rākūt iv. 1 this Psalm is "quoted as the justification for saying grace at mealtimes," Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 99. The Mekilta, Tract. Shirata on Ex. 15:1, quotes this text in support of the fact that Yahweh is rich when compared with earthly kings, Lauterbach, Mekilta II, p. 9. See also Moffatt, 1 Cor., p. 143. Midrash Rabbah, Song of Solomon 4:4, p. 193, notes the use of Psa. 24:1 by the Levites in the temple. On Ge., p. 83; Ex., p. 468;

Evidently Paul did not know any specific word of the Lord to quote regarding clean and unclean foods<sup>1</sup> but this OT quotation provided a suitable answer to the libertarian cry, "All things are lawful." The use of the Psalm, however, placed freedom in a specific context; that of Christian edification.<sup>2</sup> In comparing Ro. 14:14, 20 with 1 Cor. 10:26 Conzelmann writes:

Beide Briefe bieten hier ein Paradigma für die konkrete Bedeutung des Schöpferglaubens für die Einstellung zur Welt, für die Begründung der Freiheit in derselben.<sup>3</sup>

This, therefore, was a new application for the OT passage. The Lordship of God over the earth, as seen by Paul, was not simply a reason for thanksgiving but opened a new freedom for the believer.<sup>4</sup> This attitude of freedom became the means whereby a weaker brother could be freed from his cultural and primitive religious concepts. But it also, more importantly, became the perspective by which the mature were able to appreciate their freedom and, at the same time, also to see the positive reasons

---

Num., p. 568; and Num., p. 876, all reflect a similar use of the Psalm.

<sup>1</sup>Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 208, n. 16. See, however, Ro. 14:14, 20.

<sup>2</sup>1 Cor. 10:23, 32.

<sup>3</sup>Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 209, n. 16, cont.

<sup>4</sup>Wendland, 1 Kor., p. 75, writes: "Hier wirkt der Glaube an den Schöpfer statt der kultischen Ängstlichkeit des Judentums."

for its situational limitation. The fact of divine lordship over the earth continued from the OT and became infused with Christian content. Continuity of deity and piety is implied.

PSALM 110:1 (109:1 LXX), 1 CORINTHIANS 15:25Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
כש	κάθου	
	ἐκ	
ליחיני	δεξιῶν	
	μοῦ	
		δεῖ
		γάρ
		αὐτόν
		βασιλεύειν
-ty	ἕως	ἄχρι
	ἀν	οὗ
תשא	θῶ	θῆ
		πάντας
	τούς	τούς
יבוי	ἐχθρούς	ἐχθρούς
	σου	
תת	ὑποπόδιον	ὑπό
	τῶν	τούς
ללגלג	ποδῶν	πόδας
	σου	αὐτοῦ

Mt. 22:44 and Mk. 12:36: Εἶπεν κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου,  
 Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἕως ἄν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποκάτω  
 τῶν ποδῶν σου.

Heb. 1:13: Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἕως ἄν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς

σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου.

Heb. 10:12b-13: . . . ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ, . . .  
ἕως τεθῶσιν οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτοῦ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ.

### Masoretic Variants

BHS gives a variant of the omission of ל before  
ךלך in several MSS. A few MSS add לך- to ילךלך.

### Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX lists no variants for this section.

### New Testament Variants

These are the pertinent variants listed by  
Tischendorf. ἀχρὶ is read by κ\* A B\* and P while ἀχρὶς  
is read by κ<sup>C</sup> B<sup>3</sup> D E F G K L. ἀχρὶ οὐ without ἀν is read  
by κ\* B D\* F G P while ἀν is included in κ<sup>C</sup> D<sup>b</sup> and <sup>C</sup> K L.  
ἐχθρούς without αὐτοῦ is read by κ B D E K L P but αὐτοῦ  
is present in A F G. F<sup>gr</sup> G and g omit αὐτοῦ after τοὺς  
ποδας.

### Textual

The verbal correspondence, though loose, is  
related to the use of the verb τίθημι, the identical  
words τοὺς ἐχθρούς, and the τῶν ποδῶν - τοὺς πόδας rela-  
tionship. Sense correspondence is present in the rela-  
tionships of ἕως to ἄχρι ὑποπόδιον to ὑπό, and σου to  
αὐτοῦ. This is therefore a clear reference to Psalm  
110:1. The γάρ should not be considered a formal IF  
because it clearly presents an illative connection of the



Psalm with the preceding syntax rather than providing the sense of "for it stands written." The phrase δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν may be a broad paraphrase of the LXX κἀθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου. Because, at present, there is no Hebrew or Greek MSS evidence for Paul's readings, these variant readings appear to be due to hermeneutical alterations.

### Contextual

The Psalm ascribes glory and dominion to the king with a view to his future total rule over his enemies. Paul's use of this verse is in a context of the description of the proper order, τάγματι,<sup>1</sup> surrounding the final consummation of Christ's rule. The kingdom would be handed over to the Father<sup>2</sup> but only after Christ had subjected all powers.

### Hermeneutical

Jewish Usage. This verse from Psalm 110 had an interesting use in rabbinical literature. It was used in the Mekilta<sup>3</sup> to comment on the concept of overthrowing the enemies of God. The specific phrase quoted by Paul was, in the Mekilta, implied by the sign of "etc.," (וְכוּ) because only the first part of Psalm 110:1 was quoted. In

---

<sup>1</sup>1 Cor. 15:23.

<sup>2</sup>1 Cor. 15:24.

<sup>3</sup>Tract. Shirata on Ex. 15:7-8, vol. II, Lauterbach, Mek., p. 6.

MR on Leviticus,<sup>1</sup> Psalm 110:1 was quoted with reference to God's giving the priesthood to Abraham. This was proved by the fact the Lord, presumably Yahweh, said these things unto David's Lord, Abraham.

In the Midrash on the Psalms<sup>2</sup> R. Shallum taught that "sit at hand" meant that David was to wait until he could be king after Saul. Another interpretation was that God told Abraham to sit at his right hand and let Yahweh fight his battles:

That God did so is not made plain in the narrative [in Genesis]. Who made it plain? David, who said: The Lord saith unto my Lord: 'sit thou at my right hand.'<sup>3</sup>

With reference to Isa. 16:5, the Messiah would also be told to sit while God fought His battles.<sup>4</sup> It is this last interpretation which most nearly approximates that espoused by the Apostle.

This OT reference was drawn from a common source for NT testimonies but here alone the significance of ἀχρὶ (ἕως LXX) is explained.<sup>5</sup> The verse served to clar-

<sup>1</sup>Freedman, MR, p. 320.

<sup>2</sup>William G. Braude, The Midrash On Psalms (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959), p. 207.

<sup>3</sup>Braude, MOP, p. 207.      <sup>4</sup>Braude, MOP, p. 207.

<sup>5</sup>Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 147. See Traugott Holtz, "Zur Interpretation Des Alten Testaments Im Neuen Testament," Theologische Literaturzeitung 99 (1974), regarding the complex and detailed OT in NT schema present in 1 Cor. 15:3-5.

ify the position that the hostile powers which were destroyed at the crucifixion would ultimately be destroyed.<sup>1</sup> Psalm 8 was cited after Psalm 110:1 in several NT books and this fact is used to argue for a testimony collection.<sup>2</sup> It seems, then, that Ps. 110 was understood messianically by the early Christians.<sup>3</sup> The significant addition of πάντας before τοὺς ἐχθρούς was due to harmonization to Psalm 8:7 in 1 Cor. 15:27 which was most likely already present in Paul's thoughts.

---

<sup>1</sup>Héring, 1 Cor., p. 167. Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 356, shows that the son continues to hold the βασιλεία because it "has been so decreed by God, and the decree has been made known in Prophecy." Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 367, notes that the phrase "under his feet" is "an oriental way of indicating complete subjection." It is "not the victory itself but the public indication of the victory." Simon Kistemaker, The Psalm Citations In The Epistle To The Hebrews (Amsterdam: Wed. G. Van Soest N.V., 1961), p. 107, compares this passage with Heb. 2:8ff noting the verb "to subject" is a key word in both. Lindars, NTA, p. 50, calls this a metaphysical use of enemies with no intention of allegory. He notes that this sense of subjugation of spiritual enemies is "simply the consequence of applying the first half of the verse [Psa. 110:1a] to the heavenly session of the Messiah."

<sup>2</sup>Sidney G. Sowers, The Hermeneutics Of Philo And Hebrews (Zurich: EVA-Verlag, 1965), p. 85. See Heb. 1:13-2:6f; 1 Cor. 15:27; Eph. 1:20, 22; 1 Pet. 3:22. Black, SJT 7:173, sees this testimony as first applied to Jesus as the Son of man. Bruce, P&J, p. 90, writes: "For it seems to have been common ground to Jews and Christians in New Testament times that the oracle was addressed to the Davidic Messiah, and for those who believed Jesus to be the Messiah the words introducing the oracle implied that Jesus was Lord." The two-fold use of κύριος in Psa. 110:1 helped cause Christ to be called κύριος where the Hebrew equals Yahweh. Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 273, cautions that one cannot be too specific in showing what is to be proved.

<sup>3</sup>Wendland, Kor., p. 129.

It appears that Paul had freely adapted the Psalm into his context. In doing so he had drawn out an important implication of the believers' corporate unity with Christ.<sup>1</sup> He took ἄχρι as the temporal aspect of his assertion that Christ must (δεῖ) reign. An equivalence is seen between βασιλεύειν in 1 Cor. and the sitting at the right hand of Psalm 110:1. The changes from ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου to ὑπό τούς πόδας αὐτοῦ are resultant from the freedom of the quotation and its incorporation into its new syntactical framework. The tradition from which Paul learned his Scriptures saw Psa. 110 as a messianic reference and the Apostle made the reference specific in application to Jesus of Nazareth, Paul's messiah.

---

<sup>1</sup>Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 323, n. 92, writes: "Im Psalm bezeichnet ἕως οὗ den Endzustand des Sieges. Paulus macht daraus eine zeitliche Grenze: V. 28!"

PSALM 112:9 (111:9 LXX), 2 CORINTHIANS 9:9

Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
		καθώς
		γέγραπται
רזר	εσκόρπισεν	έσκόρπισεν
נהן	έδωκεν	έδωκεν
	τοῖς	τοῖς
לאביונים	πένησιν	πένησιν
	ἡ	ἡ
דקדקו	δικαιοσύνη	δικαιοσύνη
	αὐτοῦ	αὐτοῦ
ממך	μένει	μένει
לך	εἰς	εἰς
	τόν	τόν
	αἰῶνα	αἰῶνα
	τοῦ	
	αἰῶνος	

Masoretic Variants

BHS offers no variants.

Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX lists no variants for this section.

New Testament Variants

Tou αἰωνος is added after αἰωνα by F G K 6 39 42  
238 f g vg cle (et. harm<sup>1</sup> tol, non am fu demid) aeth.

### Textual

Paul followed the LXX rendering except for the omission of τοῦ αἰῶνος.

### Contextual

Psalm 112 is an acrostic wisdom Psalm. Though there is no plainly identifiable structure, the content is that of "typical wisdom sayings which describe the just Godfearing man and which reflect Proverbs and other wisdom books."<sup>1</sup>

Paul wrote in the context of the offering for the Jerusalem church. As we will see,<sup>2</sup> Paul could use the OT as an example for cheerful giving, and in this passage he has brought the OT to bear on the issue of God's ability to provide abundantly for the giver.<sup>3</sup>

### Hermeneutical

Regarding the omission of τοῦ αἰῶνος this most likely was done for brevity.<sup>4</sup> Plummer notes that it is not omitted in order to limit the application to the present life.<sup>5</sup> The context of the quotation is limited,

---

<sup>1</sup>Roland E. Murphy, "Psalms," from The Jerome Biblical Commentary (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968), p. 597.

<sup>2</sup>Prov. 22:9; 2 Cor. 9:7.      <sup>3</sup>2 Cor. 9:8-9.

<sup>4</sup>Toy, QNT, p. 188.

<sup>5</sup>Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 262. See Jn. 8:51, 11:26, 12:34 for εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα for the future life as well.

however, to the specific of the collection.

Midrash Rabbah<sup>1</sup> applied Psa. 112:9 to David "of whom it is written," and the part of Psa. 112:9<sup>2</sup> which was not included in Paul's quotation was applied to the priesthood.<sup>3</sup>

In Paul's usage it is important to note the pervasive connection between the receiving of God's grace<sup>4</sup> and the resultant outflow of good works.<sup>5</sup> Since the word "righteousness" in the Psalm had been translated alms and often had this meaning in Jewish writings, Menzies conjectures that Paul may have had that sense in his mind when he used the passage.<sup>6</sup> The other option offered by Menzies is that Paul could have understood the word in the sense of merit.<sup>7</sup> The latter is more to Paul's point. For Paul, however, this was not a question of good works being the catalyst for receiving the grace of God, but rather, just the opposite.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Freedman, MR Lev., p. 445.

<sup>2</sup>" . . . his horn shall be exalted with honour."  
KJV

<sup>3</sup>Freedman, MR Lam., p. 168, also n. 6, p. 168.

<sup>4</sup>2 Cor. 9:8a.

<sup>5</sup>2 Cor. 9:8b.

<sup>6</sup>Menzies, 2 Cor., p. 66. e.g. see Mt. 6:1.

<sup>7</sup>Menzies, 2 Cor., pp. 66-67.

<sup>8</sup>Hanson, SPTT, p. 180, writes: "We can hardly envisage Paul as preaching in Galatians and Romans a doctrine of justification in Christ, and in 2 Corinthians a doctrine of justification by almsgiving."



In the Psalm itself the phrase ἡ δικαιοσύνη αὐτοῦ μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος occurs twice, both times in reference to the man who is the subject of the Psalm. The term δίκαιος occurs in Psa. 112:4, 5 in reference to the class of men of which the subject of the Psalm is a member. In fixing the sense attached to δικαιοσύνη in this Psalm it is important to note the description of the man in question: he is ὁ φοβούμενος τὸν κύριον, vs 1. This must be linked with the last verse of the preceding Psalm, ἀρχὴ σοφίας φόβος κυρίου. In other words, the subject of the Psalm 112 is the man who trusts in the Lord, (vs 7) fears him, (vs 1b) and delights in His commandments.

In 2 Cor. 8:7 Paul exhorted the readers to abound ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ χάριτι with reference to the collection. In 2 Cor. 8:9 χάρις was used of the Lord's act of giving and Himself for their enrichment. Χάρις refers to the act of giving and not the gift alone. Χάριτος was used of the gift.<sup>1</sup> The collection is termed ἀδρότητι.<sup>2</sup> Χάριν was used of the grace of God<sup>3</sup> as the cause of good works. In 2 Cor. 9:11 the enrichment was once again to bountifulness, εἰς πᾶσαν ἀπλότητα.

Paul, therefore, has in mind the good deeds of the Corinthians as being resultant from their reception of

---

<sup>1</sup>2 Cor. 8:19.

<sup>2</sup>2 Cor. 8:20.

<sup>3</sup>2 Cor. 9:8.

the grace of God, or, to put it another way, as a natural outflow of their relationship with God. This is quite similar to the relationship established in Psalm 112:9 and therefore the use of δικαιοσύνη need not present any soteriological stumbling blocks. While it will be considered in detail in the quotation from Isa. 55:10 (2 Cor. 9:10), it may be helpful to note in passing that this conclusion is supported by Paul's use of "the fruits of your righteousness" in the next verse. It appears that righteousness and its fruits are not clearly distinguished in moving from the quotation to the following verse.

Paul's mention of the good work in 2 Cor. 9:8 was his link with the good works of the man in the Psalm. Plummer,<sup>1</sup> however, thinks Paul has made God the subject of 2 Cor. 9:9 which causes him to conclude that "quotations are often made, and with the more effect, with a complete change of application." It is more probable that Paul saw the image of the godly man in Psa. 112 to be a fitting picture of the man who, contemporaneously with Paul, had received the grace of God in Christ. Therefore as the grace of God in Christ would abound to every good work, a similar pattern of the fear of God as the heart and motivation of the good works was apparent in the Psalm. It is to be noted that the blessed man follows the pattern

---

<sup>1</sup>Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 261.

of Yahweh,<sup>1</sup> therefore the OT passage describes the actions of the truly blessed man. Significantly, Paul was in the process of exhortation which makes it more probable that he described what a righteous man did rather than what he was. This is also the emphasis of Psa. 112. Paul, dealing with a very practical matter, has applied this verse to the righteous man and his actions thereby applying the verse in its historical and contextual sense.

---

<sup>1</sup>Mitchell Dahood, Psalms III (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1970), p. 127, cf. Psa. 111:3.

PSALM 116:10 (115:1 LXX), 2 CORINTHIANS 4:13Textual Display

<u>Mt</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
		κατά
		τό
		γεγραμμένον
יְהוָה	ἐπίστευσα	ἐπίστευσα
יָד	διό	διό
		καί
יָדָה	ἐλάλησα	ἐλάλησα

Masoretic Variants

BHS proposes that יָד be read in place of יָדָה.

Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX lists no variants for this section.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that καὶ is included by κ F G g Syr<sup>utr</sup> arm go Epiph<sup>367</sup> Aug<sup>ep187</sup> but is excluded by B C D E K L P<sup>al omh vid</sup> d e f r vg (item cop a<sup>e</sup>lth, sed om etiam, pariter ac vg<sup>ms</sup> ap Ln, ante λαλουμεν) Chr Thdrt Dan Ambrst.

Textual

The only variation from the LXX is the addition of καὶ.

Contextual

Psalms 116 is an individual lament and Hallel.

The immediate context of the quotation is thanksgiving for Yahweh's deliverance.

Paul had demonstrated the superiority of the Christian ministry in the midrash of 2 Cor. 3 and in chapter 4 he asserted his diligent attitude to its accomplishment in spite of quite adverse external difficulties.

### Hermeneutical

This introductory formula (κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον) is not used by Paul elsewhere in the NT. It has the same intent as καθὼς γέγραπται both in referring to an OT passage (γέγραπται) and implying some form of a similarity or parallel (καθὼς). Deissmann notes that this IF is exemplified in the legal language of 52-53 A.D.<sup>1</sup>

Paul's use of the Psalm is seen by some to bear a different meaning than the Psalmist's. Barrett asserts that Paul paid no heed to the OT context but merely made use of the two significant words "believe" and "speak."<sup>2</sup> Also, the LXX of the Psalm is far from the sense of the Hebrew.<sup>3</sup> The Psalmist asserted that even though he spoke of his great affliction he nevertheless still maintained his faith: "Paul affirms that he speaks with the Spirit

---

<sup>1</sup>G. Adolf Deissmann, Bible Studies, trans. Alexander Grieve (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901), p. 250. See also Barrett, 2 Cor., p. 142.

<sup>2</sup>Barrett, 2 Cor., p. 142.

<sup>3</sup>Hanson, SPTT, p. 17.

of faith when he contemplates the certainty of resurrection."<sup>1</sup> But, more than this, Paul asserted it was the same spirit of faith as the Psalmist.

Paul attributed to the Psalmist the attitude that faith made him believe he would continue on in life even though external circumstances seemingly contradicted this belief, and therefore he spoke as he did.<sup>2</sup>

Dahood writes that Paul has quoted the Alexandrian version "which was an honest but unsuccessful attempt to reproduce the extremely difficult Hebrew original."<sup>3</sup> The concept of the Hebrew Psalm was that the writer, while in great tribulation, did not abandon his faith but cried out for and received deliverance.<sup>4</sup> Toy notes that ׀ is not translated as δὲ but must rather mean "that," "when,"<sup>5</sup> "if," "because."<sup>6</sup> Paul's meaning is best found in a relationship of cause and effect between faith and his preaching.<sup>7</sup> If Dahood's conjec-

---

<sup>1</sup>Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 198. The genitive of πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως is subjective and the quotation was designed to show that Paul had a "Glaubensgeist" like in the Psalm, Bultmann, 2 Kor., p. 123, n. 98 as in 1 Cor. 4:21 and Gal. 6:1.

<sup>2</sup>Menzies, 2 Cor., p. 32.

<sup>3</sup>Mitchell J. Dahood, "Two Pauline Quotations from the OT," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 17 (Jan. 1955), p. 23.

<sup>4</sup>Dahood, CBQ 17:23.

<sup>5</sup>Dahood, CBQ 17:23, writes that the translation "when" is "quite impossible."

<sup>6</sup>Toy, QNT, p. 183.

<sup>7</sup>Dahood, CBQ 17:23.

ture<sup>1</sup> of revocalizing דָּבַר to the pu'al of dibber "to drive, pursue, persecute" be followed, then the OT כִּי would need to be seen as a concessive particle "even though." Dahood's translation is as follows: "I trusted even though I was persecuted."<sup>2</sup> But Paul obviously followed the LXX text and conceptuality.<sup>3</sup> Thus the hermeneutical use of the OT conforms to the following of an OT pattern, or, as Ellis writes, "a typological frame of reference."<sup>4</sup> Bonsirven writes:

Sentant en lui l'esprit de foi que le psalmiste (116,10 suivant la lettre des LXX) assure posséder, S. Paul réclame (2 Cor. 4,13) pareillement le droit de parler hardiment.<sup>5</sup>

The triple mention of death in 2 Cor. 4:10-12 is also reminiscent of the first 9 vss of Psa. 116 [114 LXX]. The context of Paul's quotation is, therefore, very apt for the inclusion of the Psalm. He has used the authority of the LXX to support his attitude.<sup>6</sup> Plummer finds

<sup>1</sup>Dahood, CBQ 17:23.

<sup>2</sup>Dahood, CBQ 17:24. See BDB, p. 473b for many instances of a concessive *kī* followed by the *yqtl* verbal form, as here.

<sup>3</sup>Oostendorp, AJ, p. 65, writes that "the specific point which he proves by his quotation is that speaking based on faith is good."

<sup>4</sup>Ellis, PUOT, p. 134. See Collange, E2Cor., pp. 168-69, who stresses the content of faith required and its Christological orientation.

<sup>5</sup>Bonsirven, EREP, p. 320.

<sup>6</sup>Allo, 2 Cor., p. 116, writes: "Mais il avait le droit de s'appuyer sur les LXX dont l'autorité était reçue de ses auditeurs comme de lui."



it remarkable that Paul used the LXX translation which was "certainly wrong."<sup>1</sup>

The quotation is part of a prepositional phrase which modifies a participial phrase<sup>2</sup> which modifies the verbs πιστεύομεν and λαλοῦμεν. A second participial phrase begins with εἰδότες and provided the ground or motivation for the faith expressed by Paul. Therefore, Paul's understanding of the OT quotation can be ascertained through the meaning of the two participial phrases. The object of the faith demonstrated by Paul and the Psalmist was God. The specific reasons for each one's faith differed but the concept of faith in God in the midst of trial was common to both contexts and provided the reason for Paul's phrase "ἔχοντες δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως. . . ." One does not need to assert, as does Hanson,<sup>3</sup> that the Messiah was the subject of the quotation as understood by Paul. The second participial phrase,<sup>4</sup> mentioning the resurrection of Christ, relates to Paul's discussion of death in the preceding quotation.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 133.

<sup>2</sup>ἔχοντες δε κτλ, 2 Cor. 4:13.

<sup>3</sup>Hanson, SPTT, pp. 17-18.

<sup>4</sup>2 Cor. 4:14 εἰδότες κτλ.

<sup>5</sup>αὐτὸ is related to the κατὰ of the IF not to the person of Jesus spoken of just before and after the quotation.

Faith was one line of continuity from the OT to the NT which was clearly drawn by Paul. Continuity of deity is also implied.

## PROVERBS

PROVERBS 3:4, 2 CORINTHIANS 8:21Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
	<u>3:3b</u>	
	και	
-קצח	εὐρήσεις	
יח	χάριν	
	<u>3:4</u>	
	καί	
-לשכח	προνοοῦ	προνοοῦμεν
		γάρ
יח	καλά	καλά
		οὔ
		μόνον
יביני	ἐνώπιον	ἐνώπιον
יחל	κυρίου	κυρίου
		ἀλλά
	καί	καί
		ἐνώπιον
יח	ἀνθρώπων	ἀνθρώπων

Ro. 12:17 προνοοῦμενοι καλᾷ ἐνώπιον πάντων ἀνθρώπων.

Masoretic Variants

BHK lists no variants for this section.

### Septuagintal Variants

Swete lists no variants for this section.

### New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that προνοουμεν γαρ is read by  
 κ B D E F G P <sup>6</sup> 11 67\*\* 80 91 f<sup>c</sup>er d e f g m<sup>23</sup> vg syrsch and p  
 arm Chr<sup>668</sup> Aug op mon Ambrst while c 17 21 26 32 37  
 39 47 73 cop. go. Clem<sup>302</sup> Chr mosc ω Euthal cod Cyr  
 ador <sup>408</sup> read προνοουμενοι γαρ. Προνοουμενοι is read by  
 K L Thdrt Dam. The second ενωπιον is omitted by κ\* but  
 added by a later corrector.

### Textual

This is a free quotation from Prov. 3:4. The LXX seems to have misinterpreted the Hebrew by reading כחש as a verb in the imperative.<sup>1</sup> The quotation agrees with the LXX against the Hebrew. Paul's quotation has ού μόνον after καλά, αλλά after κυρίου and ένώπιον after καί, all of which finds no LXX or Hebrew MSS support at present.

### Contextual

In Prov. 3 a son is exhorted to remember the words of his father and to make mercy and truth an intimate aspect of his character (vs 3) with the result that he will find approbation in the sight of God and man.

In 2 Cor. 8 Paul has turned the subject to that of

---

<sup>1</sup>Toy, QNT, p. 162, and Hanson, SPTT, p. 128.

the offering for the church of Jerusalem. After encouraging them to complete the gift, Paul, in vss 16-24, explained the precautions he had taken to ensure the safe and proper delivery of their contribution.

### Hermeneutical

Philo used this passage in Ebr. 84 where he reads, "προνοούντων καλὰ ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἀνθρώπων," with reference to attaining excellence. The passage also appears in MR<sup>1</sup> where it is used to support the exposition of Numbers 11:6 which speaks of God being gracious or imparting grace wherever He goes. In MR Esther 2:15 this passage is used to refer to the heavenly and earthly beings. In MR Song of Solomon<sup>2</sup> it is used to support women abstaining from going out perfumed in order to carry out the injunction of Numbers 32:22 and Prov. 3:4. Finally, in the Mishnah this verse is used as the aim of exercising all circumspection in the removal of shekels from the shekel-chamber of the temple.<sup>3</sup>

Therefore, in spite of the mistranslation by the Greek OT, one cannot say that Paul exploited it for his own purpose because his basic interpretation is found not only in the above-cited passages but also in the Talmud.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Freedman, MR Num., p. 436.

<sup>2</sup>Freedman, MR, p. 157.      <sup>3</sup>Danby, Mish., p. 155.

<sup>4</sup>Hanson, SPTT, p. 129, writes: "What seems to us a fantastic and far-fetched interpretation of some text often proves to be simply the generally accepted under-

In Ro. 12:17 this verse was quoted to alleviate self-righteous veng<sup>e</sup>ance. Here its application centers on Paul's sensitivity regarding the appearance of his actions in the eyes of the world. This is straightforward application of the OT to the aspirations and intentions of the apostles. It shows how a fundamental aspect of OT piety remained part of Paul's piety in Christ.

---

standing of it in Paul's day. Paul the unscrupulous perverter of Scripture often turns out to be simply Paul the well-read rabbi."

PROVERBS 22:9 (:8a LXX), 2 CORINTHIANS 9:7Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
-יִשׁ	ἄνδρα	
יָג	ἱλαρόν	ἱλαρόν
		γάρ
	καί	
	δόξην	δόξην
כינ		
יָגִי	εὐλογεῖ	ἀγαπᾷ
	ὁ	ὁ
	θεός	θεός

Masoretic Variants

BHK lists no variants for this section.

Septuagintal Variants

Swete lists no variants for this section. Field notes that Origen reads εὐλογεῖ ὁ θεός and alia exempl. Ἀγαπα ὁ θεός. "Sic in uno alio libro margini adscriptum est; in <sup>ce</sup>eteris libris est, ἀγαπα ὁ θεός." -Nobil. sic comp., ald., codd.<sup>68 106</sup> alii. Haec, ἀνδρα-συντελεσει, absunt a Syro-hex., et cod. 23.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf lists no variants for this section.



### Textual

The New Testament quotation has the substitution of ἀγαπᾷ for εὐλογεῖ and excludes ἄνδρα placing the adjectives ἰλαρόν and δότνη in a different syntactical relationship. Δότνη is used substantively and is modified by ἰλαρόν.

### Contextual

The broad context is the first collection of the proverbs of King Solomon, Prov. 10:1-22:16.<sup>1</sup>

Paul was speaking in the context of the missionary collection for the Jerusalem believers. The immediate context concerned the necessity for the giving to be done in a proper mental and spiritual attitude of freedom.

### Hermeneutical

With reference to the change of εὐλογεῖ to ἀγαπᾷ Plummer asserts that this is a memory slip because such a deliberate alteration would be foreign to Paul's methodology.<sup>2</sup> Toy, on the other hand, concludes that Paul purposefully made the exchange to the "more expressive synonym"<sup>3</sup>

The latter of these conjectures is the more plausible on

---

<sup>1</sup>See Roland Kenneth Harrison, Introduction to the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1969), p. 1012.

<sup>2</sup>Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 259.

<sup>3</sup>Toy, QNT, p. 188.

the basis of contextual evidence, especially with the absence of textual evidence for ἀγαπή. The line between allusion and quotation was very finely drawn, if drawn at all, for Paul. The use of ἀγαπή κύριος ὁσίας καρδίας in Prov. 22:11 LXX may have affected Paul's memory. This is more probable due to Paul's concentration on the inner attitude of the heart in giving (προήρηται τῇ καρδίᾳ, 2 Cor. 9:7). Also Paul may have used ἀγαπή to contrast with his previous four-fold use of the term εὐλογία in 2 Cor. 9:5-6.<sup>1</sup> It is remarkable that there is no NT MS evidence showing a harmonization of ἀγαπή back to the LXX reading. Regarding the source of Paul's quotation we are left with the conclusion of A. T. Hanson that "we are here in touch with a number of 'giving' texts from Proverbs habitually used by Paul to encourage generosity among his converts and probably inherited from his rabbinic tradition."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Philip Edgcumbe Hughes, Paul's Second Epistle To The Corinthians (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1962), p. 329, n. 63, cont. from p. 238 writes: "εὐλογία should be understood in the same sense as in the preceding verse, [2 Cor. 9:5] namely, a gift freely and spontaneously bestowed and thus constituting a blessing to the recipient." One should add that this would constitute a blessing to the giver as well. Is not this the point of the sowing metaphor?

<sup>2</sup>Hanson, SPTT, p. 178.

## ISAIAH

ISAIAH 22:13, 1 CORINTHIANS 15:32Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
אכול	φάγωμεν	φάγωμεν
	καί	καί
ושותו	πίωμεν	πίωμεν
כי		
מחר	αὔριον	αὔριον
	γάρ	γάρ
נמות	ἀποθνήσκομεν	ἀποθνήσκομεν

Masoretic Variants

BHS lists no variants for this passage.

Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX apparatus lists no variants for this section.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that L and a few others read ἀποθνησκωμεν for ἀποθνησκομεν.

Textual

The quotation is taken verbatim from the Greek OT tradition, which, at this point, appears to have been transmitted with no corruption.

### Contextual

The Isaiah context concerns the people of Jerusalem who, in time of siege, made merry and trusted in their own resources rather than in the protection of God. The NT context concerns the two attitudes which would be engendered by either the surety of resurrection on the one hand or its unreality on the other. The problem, mentioned in 1 Cor. 15:32, involved the error of disclaiming the concept of future resurrection but not necessarily of asserting that Christ was not raised. It was Paul who drew out the implications for both Christology and Soteriology by showing the necessity of the believers' resurrection as based on Christ's.<sup>1</sup> However, Paul's next remarks show that he understood the assertion of vs 12 to relate to the concept of resurrection as a reality for both Christ and men. To illustrate the manner in which belief in a future resurrection influenced the practical activities of the community Paul presented two examples in 1 Cor. 15:29-32; those of baptism for the dead and religious persecution. The former related to the state of those gone before, the latter to the ongoing results of faith in Christ.

---

<sup>1</sup>Bernardin Schneider, "The Corporate Meaning and Background of 1 Cor. 15:45b - 'O ESCHATOS ADAM EIS PNEUMA ZŌIOPOIOUN," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 29 (1969), p. 450.

### Hermeneutical

That Paul has not used the Isaiah passage in its context has been noted by several authors who assert that Paul used the words of Isaiah but imported another sentiment into them.<sup>1</sup> Wendland writes that Paul knows only two alternatives: "Auferstehungsglaube oder Verfallensein an das blosse natürliche Leben, wenn der Tod das Ende ist."<sup>2</sup> But it must be noted that the quotation is not introduced by an IF and is used in a proverbial manner. This usage carries the same basic OT sense: a hedonistic life attitude in the face of cessation of existence at the moment of death. Paul did not import another sentiment into the words of Isaiah but rather applied its original sense to another life situation. This is a striking example of how OT conceptualities and phrases became part of the NT religious vocabulary.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ellis, PUOT, p. 10, and Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 150, who finds Paul's sentiment in a passage such as Ecclesiastes 2:24a.

<sup>2</sup>Wendland, Kor., p. 131.

ISAIAH 25:8 AND HOSEA 13:14, 1 CORINTHIANS 15:54-55Textual DisplayMTLXXNTIsa. 25:8Isa. 25:8

τότε  
γενήσεται  
ὁ  
λόγος  
ὁ  
γεγραμμένος

גלג

κατέπιεν

κατεπόθη

ὁ

ὁ

המוה

θάνατος

θάνατος

εἰς

לנצח

ἰσχύσας

νῆκος

Hos. 13:14Hos. 13:14

יאה

ποῦ

ποῦ

ἡ

דברך

δίκη

σου

σου

מוה

θάνατε

θάνατε

τό

νῆκος

יאה

ποῦ

ποῦ

σου

θάνατε

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
<u>Hos. 13:14</u>	<u>Hos. 13:14</u>	
	τό	τό
ךבן	κέντρον	κεντρον
	σου	
לך	ἄδη	

### Masoretic Variants

#### Isa. 25:8

BHS notes that a few MSS read ףלל and that the Syriac, as well as Θ' and 1 Cor. 15:54 reflect a reading ףלל.

#### Hos. 13:14

Many MSS read ךבן with LXX and Syriac.

### Septuagintal Variants

#### Isa. 25:8

The GLXX notes that 613 reads αδης for θανατος and 93 reads κατισχυσας for ισχυσας. Θ' reads κατεποθη ο θανατος εις νικος, Q. Syh reads κατεπιεν ο θανατος εις νικος. α' reads καταποντισει τον θανατον εις νικος, Q. σ' reads καταποθηναι ποιησει τον θανατον εις τελος, Eus.

#### Hos. 13:14

The Göttingen LXX indicates that 22<sup>c</sup> 130 311 534 Arm., Cyrillus Alexandrinus, in part, Thph. read νικη for δικη; διαθηκη is read by 22 48 51 231 719 763. The second σου is omitted by 410 and Theophylactus Achridensis. Field notes that α' reads εομαι ρηματα σου, θανατε; σ'



reads εσομαι πληγη σου εν θανατω; θ' reads και εσται η δικη σου εν θανατω.<sup>1</sup>

### New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that the νικος and κεντρον of vs 55 are in that order in  $\aleph^*$  B C I M 17 71 vg cop arm<sup>zoh</sup> aeth<sup>ro</sup> Or<sup>3,306</sup> and int 1,80.81 Eus<sup>dem 166</sup> Ath<sup>57</sup> Did<sup>399</sup> Cyr<sup>hr214</sup> and <sup>most</sup>others. The order is reversed in  $\aleph^C$  A\*\* (\* omits που usq. νικος) D E F G K L P and <sup>most</sup>others d e f g syr<sup>utr</sup> arm<sup>cdd</sup> aeth<sup>pp</sup> go Or<sup>1,240</sup> and int 4,547 Eus<sup>dem 470</sup> and others<sup>52</sup>. <sup>Ath<sup>52</sup> Epiph<sup>698</sup> Chr<sup>462</sup> bis Thdr<sup>t</sup> Euther<sup>serm 15</sup> (ap Thdr<sup>t</sup> 5,1165) Tert<sup>res carn 47,51,54</sup> Cyp<sup>321</sup> Hil<sup>1102</sup> al.</sup> θανατε bis cum  $\aleph^*$  B C D E F G I 39 67\*\* d e f g vg cop aeth<sup>ro</sup> Eus<sup>dem 166</sup> and 470 Ir<sup>int 222.308</sup> Or<sup>int 1,80.81</sup> and 4,547 Tert<sup>marc 5,10</sup> <sup>et res carn 47,51,54 Hil<sup>1102</sup> Amb<sup>saepe</sup> Aug<sup>saepe</sup> al mu</sup> altero loco et id quidem ante το νικος habet αδη (sed testium quos adscribimus multi ante το κεντρον) cum  $\aleph^C$  A\*\* K L M P al pler Syr<sup>utr</sup> arm go aeth<sup>pp</sup> Or<sup>1,240</sup> and 3,306 Ath<sup>52</sup> Did<sup>399</sup> al mu. Robertson<sup>2</sup> notes that because the Hebrew and LXX differed, subsequent NT scribes were influenced by one or the other.

### Textual

#### Isa. 25:8

Paul's quotation displayed a Theodotionic text-type. Alfred Rahlfs<sup>3</sup> sees Paul's correspondence with θ'

<sup>1</sup>Fridericus Field, Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt II (Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1875), Hosea 13:14.

<sup>2</sup>Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 378.

<sup>3</sup>Alfred Rahlfs, "Über Theodotion-Lesarten im

to be limited to εἰς νῆκος, the verb being a later Christian correction to the Greek OT MSS. This single similarity is then seen to be a result not of textual dependence of Paul on Θ' but of both independently being closer approximations to the sense of the Hebrew.<sup>1</sup> Even if Rahlfs' idea of interpolation be correct and the similarities are diminished, to base their agreement on a shared closeness to the Hebrew text is precarious in light of recent discoveries concerning the age and pervasiveness of Θ'. Rahlfs finds the Syh. reading to be more fitting to Theodotion's style of revision and sees the Q reading as too radical regarding the syntax of the nominative subject with the passive verb.<sup>3</sup> With νῆκος the only link with Θ' and νῆκος being found also in α' the proof of a Theodotionic reading evaporates.<sup>4</sup>

Bruce supports the position that the quotation was not produced from a variant LXX version but in a

---

Neuen Testament und Aquila-Lesarten bei Justin," Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 20 (1921), p. 184.

<sup>1</sup>Rahlfs, ZNW 20:188-89.

<sup>2</sup>See for example, Barthélemy, DA.

<sup>3</sup>Rahlfs, ZNW 20:183.

<sup>4</sup>See Alfred Rahlfs, ed., Septuaginta II (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935), p. xxvii.

version approximate to that of Aquila and Theodotion. In α' and Θ' εἰς νῆκος is the translation of נצנל which is seen in several other LXX passages.<sup>1</sup> According to a recent study the נצנל/νῆκος translation pattern is a characteristic of the καίτε recension.<sup>2</sup> The Hebrew was mistaken for victory by some Aramaic version which underlies Aquila and Theodotion.<sup>3</sup> Arndt and Gingrich write that νῆκος "agrees w. the improvement which Theod. made in the LXX wording of Is. 25:8."<sup>4</sup> Conzelmann also sees a "vortheodotionische" text-type here.<sup>5</sup>

While νῆκος appears in Isa. 25:8 of Θ' Syh, Q and α', it is not to be found in other LXX MSS. Paul therefore exhibits an early first century Greek OT reading which appears to be limited to the Palestine area.

---

<sup>1</sup>נצנל means "for ever." See 1 Chron. 29:11 where נצנל means the splendor (of victory). Peter Walters, ed. D. W. Gooding, The Text Of The Septuagint (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1973), p. 331, n. 4, notes that Hebrew has no word which has the primary meaning of victory. See also Randolph, TPNT, p. 40, H&R under νῆκος and Turpie, QTN, p. 134.

<sup>2</sup>John A. Grindel, "Another Characteristic Of The KAIGE Recension: נצנל/νῆκος," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 31 (1969), p. 500.

<sup>3</sup>Moffatt, 1 Cor., p. 267.

<sup>4</sup>William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago: The University Press, 1957), p. 542. Rahlfs, LXX I, p. xxvii, writes that the rendering of εἰς νῆκος corrects an "all too inaccurate LXX translation of נצנל. . . ." He denies that conformity of Paul with <sup>a</sup>Theodotion <sup>type reading</sup> does not justify the assumption of an original of Theodotion which was older than Paul.

<sup>5</sup>Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 349.

Why Héring writes that vs 54b is "not a biblical quotation, and Nestle is wrong to mark it as such" is explained when he says that it is instead an interpretive reply to Isaiah 25:8 inserted by Paul.<sup>1</sup> But with the textual evidence of several Greek OT versions, the possibility of quotation should not be so completely ruled out. Grosheide also writes that this is not based on the LXX or MT but perhaps he also does not find the evidence of the parallel with Theodotion convincing.<sup>2</sup>

Hos. 13:14

The LXX MSS reading of  $\nu\lambda\eta$  for  $\delta\lambda\eta$  may also reflect the early tradition followed by Paul. However, Rudolph cautions that the change of  $\nu\lambda\eta$  for  $\delta\lambda\eta$  in various MSS of the LXX is due to the influence of 1 Cor. 15:55.<sup>3</sup> Another possibility is that Paul has simply continued the use of  $\nu\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  from the Isa. 25:8 quotation.<sup>4</sup> Swete and Dodd see it as a conflation which would be a free mixture of the two passages.<sup>5</sup> Because the variant

---

<sup>1</sup>Héring, 1 Cor., p. 181.

<sup>2</sup>Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 393.

<sup>3</sup>Wilhelm Rudolph, Hosea (Stuttgart: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1966), p. 239, n. 14.

<sup>4</sup>See Rudolph, Hos., p. 239, n. 14.

<sup>5</sup>Swete, IOTG, p. 400. Dodd, AS, p. 76. Bonsirven, EREP, pp. 54-55, defines a conflation as "plusieurs textes cités bout à bout mais sous une seule formule d'introduction." Paul's combination of two verses into one under one IF is rare in the Rabbis, Rodolphe Morissette, "Un Midrash Sur La Mort," Revue Biblique 79 (1972), p. 169. See also Ellis, PUOT, pp. 50f.

εἰς νῦνος appears several times as an integral part of the quotation this conflation may have been known to Paul in this form.<sup>1</sup> Conversely, if Paul's Greek OT contained the variant, the conflation could be attributed to Paul's own invention. The Syriac approximates Paul. Randolph,<sup>2</sup> following his curious argument, concludes that the Hebrew, not the Greek, had been corrupted. Ellis, however, feels that Paul was dependent on the Hebrew.<sup>3</sup>

While Bruce writes that νῦνος is not found in any known Greek version of the passage of Hosea his conclusion that Paul probably selected the word as an "extra link"<sup>4</sup> with the Isaiah passage may be modified by an additional fact that νῦνος is a later form for νύκη.<sup>5</sup> It is quite possible, then, that Paul was using a LXX MS with νύκη and quite naturally substituted the more current term νῦνος.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ellis, PUOT, p. 145. See also Toy, QNT, p. 181.

<sup>2</sup>Randolph, TPNT, p. 40.

<sup>3</sup>Ellis, PUOT, p. 14. Toy, QNT, p. 179, sees Paul's approximation of the Hebrew to be a result of recourse to an Aramaic reminiscence.

<sup>4</sup>Walters, TS, p. 36, sees it as possibly from the first part of the 'testimony-like' passage. Morissette, MSM, p. 173, is unable to prove a testimony basis here.

<sup>5</sup>Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon I (Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1940), p. 465.

<sup>6</sup>Morissette, MSM, p. 163. Michel, P&SB, pp. 79-80, does not decide whether the state of the text is due to a theological reformation of the text by Paul or a theological selection of available texts to suit his thought.

### Contextual

The Isaiah passage speaks of the future blessings which God would bestow upon Israel when all her enemies had been defeated<sup>1</sup> and all reproach had been removed.<sup>2</sup> The Hosea context concerns God's judgments on Ephraim. In His wrath God would hide compassion from His sight.<sup>3</sup>

The NT context is that of the final victory over death brought about by the resurrection power of God as exercised among His people.

### Hermeneutical

In the Mishnah,<sup>4</sup> Isa. 25:8 is said to speak of a time to come when God would swallow up death and remove all tears. Therefore, one should not wail or lament after the burial of a corpse. In the Mekilta<sup>5</sup> reference is made to Isa. 25:8 with emphasis on "for the Lord hath spoken it." The question is asked, "where was this spoken?" The answer is given in Deut. 32:39, "It is I who put to death and give life."<sup>6</sup> The idea was that the observances of Ex. 12:25-28 were only to be observed in

---

<sup>1</sup>Isa. 25:10.      <sup>2</sup>Isa. 25:8.      <sup>3</sup>Hos. 13:14b.

<sup>4</sup>Danby, Mish., Moed Katan 3:9.

<sup>5</sup>Lauterbach, Mek. I, p. 91, Trac. Pisha Ex. 12:25-28.

<sup>6</sup>Deut. 32:39 NASV.

the Land. The immediate context of Mekilta does not supply a time reference for the actualization of the victory over death, however. In Midrash Rabbah, Isa. 25:8 is consistently used with reference to the joys of the Messianic Age, one joy being the absence of death.<sup>1</sup> This Jewish use of the passage generally agrees with Paul's interpretation. Of course Paul saw Jesus to be the Messiah of the new age and His redemptive work to be the basis of its offer of immortality.<sup>2</sup>

The intent of the Hosea passage appears to be a summons to death and Sheol to come and claim their victims.<sup>3</sup> Bruce writes that Paul, deviating from Hosea, "treats the double question as a defiant challenge to death to do its worst."<sup>4</sup> Thus the questions from Hosea may either be a summons or a challenge. While Paul understood it as a word of salvation, James Mays asserts that Hosea saw it as a summons.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Freedman, MR Gen., p. 210; Ex., p. 187, p. 349; Deut., p. 60; Lam., p. 120; Ecc., p. 12.

<sup>2</sup>This contemporizing of the OT has led Morissette, MSM, p. 161, to label this as a Midrash.

<sup>3</sup>Toy, QNT, p. 181; Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 382.

<sup>4</sup>Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 156. Bonsirven, EREP, p. 327, writes: "certains exégètes y voient un mot d'espérance. Pourquoi S. Paul n'aurait-il pas eu licence de suivre cette interprétation?"

<sup>5</sup>James L. Mays, Hosea (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1969), p. 181.



It is also important to note that Paul was not basing an argument on Scriptural proof but, rather, was using biblical language to express the final defeat of death.<sup>1</sup> However, the IF implies more than a verbal correspondence with the passages quoted, therefore, it must also be concluded that Paul saw in the quotation a support for his statements. The IF presents a fulfillment motif with reference to the future.

Paul has freely adapted the language<sup>2</sup> of Hosea 13:14. His substitution of θάνατος for ὄδης is consistent with his style. "St. Paul never uses ὄδης, perhaps because the word might have erroneous association for Greek readers," writes Robertson.<sup>3</sup> This erroneous association concerns the suggestion of a heathen god.<sup>4</sup> The change δίκη to νόμος is due to the Isaiah quotation.<sup>5</sup> Gertner<sup>6</sup> posits that Paul had applied a double reading ('al tiqrey) and a double meaning (tartey mashma') to νόμος. Gertner surmises that תּוֹרָה in Hos. 13:14 can mean either word=Torah, (λόγος) or it can mean plague

---

<sup>1</sup>Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 82. <sup>2</sup>Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 382.

<sup>3</sup>Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 378. Also Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 156. Also Moffatt, 1 Cor., p. 268. Apart from Rev. 7:8; 20:13f, Hades is not personified in the NT or sub-apostolic literature.

<sup>4</sup>Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 382. The god in question would have been Pluto.

<sup>5</sup>Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 349.

<sup>6</sup>Gertner, JSS 7:283.



or sting. This is brought forth to explain what νόμος of 1 Cor. 15:56 had to do with θάνατος. Paul first read "sting" and then re-read "law." But there is no indication that "law," in vs 56, is an interpretation of the Hosea passage. On the contrary, Gertner does not account for the fact that ἁμαρτία, not νόμος, is Paul's interpretation of "sting."

Finally, it is central to see that Paul understood Hosea 13:14a as a statement rather than an ironical question.<sup>1</sup> The most important consideration is that the LXX interpreted the passage as a statement and this is exactly the sense implied by Paul in his appropriation of the two following questions as a basis for confident assertion of future deliverance. Therefore, one needs not to see Paul as "taking his own way from Hosea" (Bruce) but in fact following in the same thought pattern presented in his Greek Hosea.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See Hans Walter Wolff, Dodekapropheten 1 Hosea (Wageningen, Netherlands: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961), p. 287 and the commentators concerning whether the Hebrew is a question (Wolff, Jerusalem Bible, NEB) or a statement [C. F. Keil, Biblical Commentary On The Old Testament, vol. I: Minor Prophets, ET James Martin (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1867), p. 159. NASV].

<sup>2</sup>S-B shows the Hosea passage to have been used in Rabbinics with reference to the deliverance from Babylon.

ISAIAH 28:11-12, 1 CORINTHIANS 14:21Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
כִּי		έν
בִּלְעָד		τῷ
שֶׁפֶשׁ		νόμῳ
וּבְלִשׁוֹן		γέγραπται
חֲרָחָה		ὅτι
יִדְבַּר	διὰ φαυλισμόν	έν ἑτερογλώσσοις
אֶל-לִשְׁוֹן	χειλεών	καί
הִזָּה	διὰ γλώσσης	έν χείλεσιν
אֶשְׁרָא	ἐτέρας	ἐτέρων
אֶמַר	ὅτι λαλήσουσιν	λαλήσω
אֶל־יָדָא	τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ	τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ
אֶת־כֹּחַ	λέγοντες αὐτοῖς	
הַחַיִּים	τοῦτο τό ἀνάπαυμα	
וְהַיִּיחַ	τῷ πεινῶντι	
לִישׁוֹן	καί τοῦτο	
אֶת־כֹּחַ	τό σύντριμμα	
הַחַיִּים	καί	καί
אֶל־יָדָא	οὐκ	οὐδ'
אֶבֹא	ἤθελησαν	οὕτως
שֶׁמֶשׁ	ἀκούειν	εἰσακούσονται μου
		λέγει
		κύριος

### Masoretic Variants

BHS notes a variant reading of נִלֵּן for מִלֵּן in 1Q Is<sup>a</sup> and other MSS. BHK notes that the Syriac reads ܢܠܢ for ܢܠܝܢ and ܢܠܢ for ܢܠܝܢ.

### Septuagintal Variants

In the GLXX apparatus 538 and the Sahidic read δολιᾶς for ἑτεράς. εἶτι is read for οὔτι by the Sahidic; qua Hi.; omitted by 22-48-51-231-763+62-147+90-130-311+36-93-96, 407. Bo.=MT. 93 has λαλουσι. 564 transposes τω λαω/T. and Syh adds ἐν γλώσση ἑτέρα: ex praec. αὐτω is read for αὐτοῖς by S\* B-B-Q<sup>mg</sup> 62-147-93 301 393 403-613 449-770 538 Theodoret = MT; σαυτω 106; omitted by 22-48-51-231-763+90-130-311-36-93. 109-736 omits the first το as does 22-48-51-231-763 62-147 36-93-96 311-130-233 49\* 239 538 Tht.: post-το. κ Α' - Q\* - 86 V 87-91+49-764 read πινωντι (vel πινοντι). The second το is omitted by 736 311-130-93-233 Tht: post-το; ἐστι 538 Coptic. Theodoret reads συντριμμα. 22-48-51-231-763+62-147+36-93-96-311-130-233-456 Syrolukan read συνταγμα and 456 adds τω διψωντι. 62 omits the second και. κ reads ηθελαν while 22-48-51-231-763+62-147+90-130-34-36-93-96-233-456 and Theodoret read ηθελον.

With reference to 1 Cor. 14:21 GLXX notes the reading of Origen:

ἐν ἑτερογλωσσοῖς καὶ ἐν χειλεσὶν ἑτέροις λαλήσω τὸ  
λας τοῦτω . . . . (εὐρον γὰρ τὰ ἰσοδυναμοῦντα τῇ  
λεξεί ταύτῃ ἐν τῇ τοῦ α' ἐρμηνείᾳ κείμενα) Or.  
Philocalia ed. Robinson, p. 55. "σ' θ' et LXX de

hoc loco diversa senserunt," Hi.<sup>1</sup>

σ' reads αλλοιας, for ετερας, 86. σ' (Tht.) for και ουκ ηθελ. ακουειν reads ουκ ηθελησαν ακουσαι.

### New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that κ<sup>C</sup> reads γεγραπται alone while κ has τι γεγραπται. ετερων is read by <sup>5</sup> A B<sup>5</sup> 6 10 17 31 39 67\*\* 73 Euthal<sup>cod.</sup>. ετεροις is read by D E F G K L P al pler mcion<sup>epiph.</sup> Or. nec aliter it vg cop rell.

### Textual

The IF (έν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται ὅτι) probably indicates that Paul quoted from memory but in doing so he shows an improvement on the mistranslation of the LXX.<sup>2</sup> This IF can generally stand for the whole OT.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Field, Hex. II, p. 479. See Turpie, OTN, p. 157, regarding Aquila. Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 322 also speaks of the possibility of Paul's use of a version later known to Aquila, as does Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 285, n. 17.

<sup>2</sup>Swete, IOTG<sup>2</sup>, p. 402. See also Dodd, AS, p. 83, and Toy, QNT, p. 176. While Swete attributed the improved translation to Paul's knowledge of the Hebrew, we see it due to the text-type which Paul had memorized; a text-type closer to the Hebrew.

<sup>3</sup>Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 285, writes: "Nach jüdischen Sprachgebrauch kann der ganze AT so bezeichnet werden." Also Toy, QNT, p. 177; Gough, NTQ, p. 321; Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 132; Hanson, SPTT, p. 266; Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 316. Metzger, JBL 70:302, shows that the Mishnah refers to the Scriptures as a whole by the word תורה; cf. Aboth 6.7, where the quotations are from Proverbs. Philo refers to the whole Pentateuch as "torah" in Quod det. Sec. 44, i, 221 and Quod Deus Sec. 1, i, 273, when quoting Gen. 12:7 and 22:9; cf. Ryle, PHS, p. xlv.

The quotation agrees neither with the MT nor with the LXX. Lindars<sup>1</sup> says the LXX text is quoted but has been radically altered. On the contrary, Robertson notes that Paul quoted freely and from a non-LXX Greek OT.<sup>2</sup> Either of these positions is possible but what is needed is MSS evidence to decide the matter. Qumran, at present, does not provide evidence for a Hebrew Vorlage for Paul's text but the  $\alpha'$  reading may be a witness to an early Palestinian Hebrew text. Aquila uses ἑτερογλώσσος in variance from the LXX in Psa. 113:1 and Isa. 33:19, thus this word is a characteristic of his translation and was a part of his Greek OT text which he did not alter. The fact that this text is a better translation of the MT is consistent with Aquila's standards. Though the evidence is not decisive, we conclude that Paul displays an Old Greek version divergent from the LXX tradition.

### Contextual

In the OT context the prophet gave warning to the inhabitants of Jerusalem that, for all their efforts to save themselves, they would be broken for their offences against Yahweh. The foreign tongue was the language of the Assyrians.

The NT context concerns the proper place of glos-

---

<sup>1</sup>Lindars, NTA, p. 175.

<sup>2</sup>Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 316. Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 285, also asserts Paul used another translation.

salalia in the Church. The quotation from Isa. 28:11-12 was used to prove that tongues were a sign for unbelievers<sup>1</sup> whose unbelief would only be aggravated by the phenomenon.

### Hermeneutical

An undertaking to reinvestigate the whole question of glossolalia cannot be made here. While some reference will be made to the wider biblical teaching on the subject, this study will be limited to understanding the use of the OT quotation in this context.

Λέγει κύριος Quotations. This quotation is one of several in the NT which incorporate the phrase λέγει κύριος.<sup>2</sup> Ellis<sup>3</sup> has shown that these quotations vary markedly from the LXX and MT and that in all the Pauline usages λέγει κύριος is part of the OT quotation. This may be evidence for a testimony collection which circulated in the earliest Church tradition. Textually, this implies that Paul did not design the text-form of the quotation. Hermeneutically, this places Paul within an existing, rather than ad hoc, interpretation of the passage.

---

<sup>1</sup>Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 285, writes: "Das Zitat ist also nur auf den einen Gedanken hin ausgewertet, dass die Zungenrede ein 'Zeichen' ist (nämlich für die Ungläubigen, →V.23)."

<sup>2</sup>Acts 7:49; 15:16f; Ro. 12:19; 14:11; 1 Cor. 14:21; 2 Cor. 6:16ff; Heb. 8:8-12; 10:16f, (10:30 is textually uncertain).

<sup>3</sup>Ellis, PUOT, pp. 107-13.

Tongues as Sign. In this quotation Paul demonstrated a correspondence between the speaking of God through the Assyrians and His speaking through the Corinthian Christians. This correspondence centered on the concept of "sign" for both Israel and the Church. The explanation and purpose of the sign was not elaborated but was inherent in the sense conveyed by the quotation. The Assyrian tongue was a sign of divine judgment and impending destruction for Jerusalem. Thus Paul asserted that as God had spoken a message to Israel through the sign of the Assyrian tongue, so also he was speaking a message to Israel through Christian glossolalia.<sup>1</sup> It is the need to decipher that sign that challenges one to understand the hermeneutical use of this passage.

Text-form. The text-form can contribute to this process. The variance of the quotation from its LXX counterpart has led some to conclude that Paul himself made the changes<sup>2</sup> and has therefore purposely altered the meaning of the original. The evidence of Aquila and Barthélemy's research in Aquila's precursors provides evidence that Paul may have found the quotation as is. Also, the omission of the middle portion does not sig-

---

<sup>1</sup>Manson, CC, p. 115, traced the origin of tongues speaking to Jerusalem.

<sup>2</sup>Toy, QNT, p. 176.

nificantly alter the meaning of the passage.

The omission excludes the most sarcastic and ironic section of the "very clever and cynical retort" by Isaiah<sup>1</sup> and reduces the historical particulars inherent in the passage. But even in Paul's shortened version, the unintelligible tongues were a message of correction from God which was frustrated by a disobedient response.

Context. Given the essential communality of sense of the OT and NT texts, a second argument, that of the radical divergence from the OT context, is more pertinent to the hermeneutical use made by Paul. One has said that the OT context "has nothing in common" with the ecstatic utterances Paul was discussing.<sup>2</sup> This position assumes that the utterances were ecstatic rather than the foreign languages of Acts. If the utterances were languages then Paul's use of Isa. 28:11-12 would be within the bounds of the OT context.<sup>3</sup> This, combined with the shared sense of a divine, but rejected, message, serves to

---

<sup>1</sup>George Adam Smith, The Book of Isaiah I (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1903), p. 157.

<sup>2</sup>Edgar, NTS 9:57, <sup>and</sup> Dodd, AS, p. 83. Bonsirven, EREP, p. 328, says that Paul's fascination with the potential typological figure has led to a sense contrary to the original. See also Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 323. Clemen, GAT, p. 199, prefers to have Paul see an analogy between Isaiah and Corinth.

<sup>3</sup>See Willis W. Wantoch, "Speaking In Tongues In First Corinthians" (Th.M. thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1970).



further Paul's harmony with the OT.

Paul presented an explanation of the OT passage in vs 22. Tongues were for a sign: a sign of God's delayed but righteous judgment in the OT historical context. That sign was for unbelieving Jews (לֹא-לָמַד הָיָה). The people had been offered rest but did not listen, therefore, the next message they would receive from God would be unavoidable judgment.

Paul Followed the LXX Interpretation. The LXX had given a different twist to the Hebrew by translating לָמַד by the participle λέγοντες which made the central section the content of the message spoken by the Assyrian tongues. The Pauline quotation has excluded this error but has imported another sense divergent from the Hebrew yet dependent upon the LXX. The final phrase in Paul's text implied that the dullness of hearing was in the face of the foreign tongues. The Hebrew phrase was, rather, a retrospective look to the days when Yahweh had spoken through his prophets, i.e. Isaiah, before He had to bring the judgment of Assyria. Thus the passage as used by Paul took up two strands of the Isaiah conceptuality: foreign tongues and disobedience but followed the LXX conceptuality by directly linking hardness of hearing with the tongues.

This structure of sense and cause/effect is seen in Paul's application of the quotation to the situation at Corinth. In 1 Cor. 14:23b he linked the derisive con-

clusion of the unskilled or unbeliever to the exclusive presence of glossolalia. To know that tongues were a sign for unbelievers was a mark of maturity. The quotation asserted that tongues were not a final effort to gain repentance before destruction but were rather a sign that talking was at an end and irrevocable judgment was at hand. Such was the bald intention of the phenomenon of glossolalia.<sup>1</sup>

Summary. Thus the concept of tongues was approached in 1 Cor. 14:21 from one perspective only, its relation to edification. In showing the primary conceptualities surrounding the original use of tongues (irreversible judgment directed to Israel) Paul showed how incompatible this was with the work of the assembled Church. The unbeliever, when given the sign, would be hardened in his unbelief: he would not listen.<sup>2</sup> This is the understanding of tongues which Paul termed "mature" in vs 20.

---

<sup>1</sup>Paul later (1 Cor. 14:26-27), effected a modification to this basic sense by the addition of one who may interpret tongues, thereby the effect moved from unintelligibility to intelligibility, from judgment to the realm of προφητεία and οἰκοδομή and thereby gained acceptability for public use in the Church.

<sup>2</sup>Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 133, notes that the scriptural proof considers the effect of tongues on the unbeliever from a historical standpoint: regarding both prophecy and tongues, tongues are a divine sign which always annoy and harden the unfaithful. See 1 Cor. 14:23. J. P. M. Sweet, "A Sign For Unbelievers: Paul's Attitude To Glossolalia," New Testament Studies 13 (1966-67), p. 242, also supports the concept of tongues as a sign of judgment.

While Paul did not violate the OT context, his transference of the significance of tongues from the OT to the NT context was innovative.<sup>1</sup> "Tongues" and "other" seem to have caught Paul's attention here as well as the context and become the basis for the comparison. The correspondence is also to be seen in the auxiliary signification of tongues as a judicial force.

---

<sup>1</sup>Judaism is quite silent in its use of this passage. S-B includes no Jewish use but only discusses the wider use of *שִׁמְשִׁי* - *חִוּרָה*. However, 1 QH 2:18 and 4:16 quote this passage with the latter being an apparent attack on glossolalia as Roy A. Harrisville, "Speaking In Tongues: A Lexicographical Study," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 38 (1976), pp. 42-43, notes. It is doubtful, however, that 1 QH 4:16 refers to glossolalia. More probable is a reference to the teaching of the Jerusalem leaders which was considered to be apostate by the Qumran covenanters.

ISAIAH 29:14, 1 CORINTHIANS 1:19

Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
		γέγραπται γάρ
הבדל	και ἀπολῶ	ἀπολῶ
הכח	τὴν σοφίαν	τὴν σοφίαν
והכח	τῶν σοφῶν	τῶν σοφῶν
ובין	και τὴν σύνεσιν	και τὴν σύνεσιν
ובין	τῶν συνετῶν	τῶν συνετῶν
קחשק	κρύψω	ἀθετήσω

Masoretic Variants

BHS lists no variants for this pericope.

Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX shows that ἀπολω is replaced by ἀφελω in Justin, Tertullian, 384; 613. Αὐτου is added after σοφων and συνετων by the Lucianic groups 22-48-51-231-763, 62 (omits αὐτου after σοφων) - 147 90-130-311 36-96 -86 (a late correction) -926 403-613 and Theodoret. This addition of αὐτου represents the translation of the third masculine singular suffixes of the Hebrew. Αὐτων is added to σοφων and συνετων by the eighth century Hexaplaric witness V, 93 and Eusebius.

A more pertinent variation is the reading αθετησω of αθετησω for κρυψω by 564<sup>txt</sup> 301 and Eusebius' commentary on Isaiah 29:14. This reading αθετησω by Eusebius in his

commentary on Isaiah and the ninth and tenth century MSS may reflect a Christian conformation of the OT text to that of 1 Corinthians 1:19 or, possibly an independent textual tradition used by Paul.

### New Testament Variants

Neither Nestle or Tischendorf offer any variants for this quotation.

### Textual

Paul varies from the LXX by the substitution of ἀθετήσω for κρύψω. The chiastic structure of the original is retained but the voice of the two verbs, which commence and conclude the chiasmus, is changed to the active in the LXX, making explicit the implicit subject of the Hebrew. The LXX and New Testament supply the actor: the Lord Himself.<sup>1</sup>

### Contextual

This quotation was taken from the section of Isaiah in which the prophet clarified the moral deficiencies which were to bring about the destruction of Judah. The reasons for this impending chaos are begun in Isa. 29:9 and concluded in Isa. 29:13 which is a protasis asserting that the peoples' hearts were far from Yahweh.

---

<sup>1</sup>With reference to 1 Cor. 1:20 we conclude that it is not a quotation but rather a reminiscence of passages from Isaiah. See Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 42.

The apodosis of Isa. 29:14 is commenced by a summation, **וְכֵן**, and a demonstrative interjection, **וְכֵן**. The rest of vs 14 provides a description of the wonder God was about to perform.

In the Corinthian context Paul has dealt with the problem of divisions<sup>1</sup> aggravated by the partisan selection of human leaders.<sup>2</sup> In 1:18-2:16 Paul contrasted the central message of the cross and the work of the Spirit with human wisdom. Paul's point was that he did not order his ministry according to the wisdom of his age. Such wisdom made the cross of no use.<sup>3</sup> The message of Christ was foolishness to the wise of his age,<sup>4</sup> therefore making it useless to adorn the Christian gospel with such sophistry. Then, to show that such had always been the way of God in contrast with worldly wisdom, Paul wrote that God would even do away with that manifestation of wisdom.

### Hermeneutical

Omission of αὐτοῦ. This quotation supplies the divine opinion of the relevance of human wisdom to the work of the gospel. With regard to the addition of αὐτοῦ or αὐτῶν to σοφῶν and συνετῶν by the Lucianic group and others, some hold that Paul made the passage apply more

---

<sup>1</sup>1:10ff.

<sup>2</sup>1:12.

<sup>3</sup>1:17.

<sup>4</sup>1:18.

broadly.<sup>1</sup> This, however, assumes that Paul was either following the Hebrew text or a Greek form of the Lucianic OT and had purposely omitted the pronouns. There is no evidence that Paul's quotations show enough consistent correlation with the Lucianic type at this point to conclude that he has altered it in this case. Though Paul's OT quotations show a Lucianic-type at certain points, he follows the OG form here. Also, the third masculine singular suffix of the MT refers to the people as a singular unit. It can be concluded, on the evidence available, that Paul was simply following a LXX<sup>AB</sup> type of text rather than consciously comparing the Hebrew and a LXX<sup>Lucian</sup> and then omitted the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew suffix. Edwin Hatch writes that "the omission of the words [αὐτῶν] both in 1 Corinthians and in the uncials of the LXX is probably due to an adaptation to the immediate purpose of the writer."<sup>2</sup> Perhaps one should say "writers." However, it still is clear that, for Paul, the absence of the pronouns cannot become evidence for hermeneutical conclusions. Paul saw no reason to add the singular or plural pronouns and merely quoted verbatim from the text before him which omitted αὐτόν or αὐτῶν.

An Incorporated Poem? An interesting hypothesis

---

<sup>1</sup>Turpie, OTN, p. 148.

<sup>2</sup>Hatch, EBG, p. 199.

has recently been put forward by K. E. Bailey<sup>1</sup> that Paul has incorporated a poem into 1 Cor. 1:17-2:2. Bailey provides an elaborate schema of grammatical diagrams which progressively depart from the facts of the text as they approach a form which supports his thesis. Bailey does violence to the grammatical sense and structure. His break between his C' (vs 26b ὅτι οὐ πολλοὶ κτλ) and B' (vs 29) does not make sense. Βλέπετε γὰρ τὴν κλησιν ὑμῶν of vs 26 is called a redactional insertion by Paul.<sup>2</sup> Even so, B' still does not show a parallelism with B (vss 18-19a). The large portions of the text which have to be relegated to a later redactional effort tells against this theory. Is the structure of the supposed poem so obvious and convincing that it should become the basis upon which the text is amended? The last half of the OT quotation in 1:19 is said to have been expanded by a later redactor, but what is Bailey's proof or methodology apart from claiming the "form" of the poem demands such a redaction?<sup>3</sup> Bailey concludes<sup>4</sup> that Paul had adjusted sections of the poem "to allow for a smooth transition into the poem from the previous discussion."

---

<sup>1</sup>K. E. Bailey, "Recovering The Poetic Structure Of 1 Cor. 1:17-ii2," Novum Testamentum 17 (1975), pp. 265-96.

<sup>2</sup>Bailey, NT 17:268.

<sup>3</sup>See Bailey, NT 17:294, where he also claims Paul would have had the poem in memory.

<sup>4</sup>Bailey, NT 17:293.



Paul then added comments that explain key words in the poem and that reinforce the original poetic structure.<sup>1</sup>

Bailey's methodology is weakest when he deals with the OT quotation in 1:19. He asserts<sup>2</sup> that the redactor added the second half of the verse because he knew it. Because this destroys Bailey's "four line balance of the unit" it could not have been original. The deciding factor is that, because the corresponding parallel in vs 31 is a one line quotation the quotation in vs 19 must also originally have been a one liner. Bailey comments that the first half of the quotation in vs 19, line B-2' [sic] (he means B-1'), is from the LXX but the last half of the quotation varies from the LXX and is therefore not original. Surely every variation from the LXX is not to be counted as inauthentic. Even if the last line of vs 14 is "secondary" in meaning it is certainly original.

The Testimony Hypothesis. Harris<sup>3</sup> notes that Justin, Dialogue with Trypho 78 and Tertullian, Adv. Mar. iii. 6, also use this testimony. Harris concludes that Paul, Justin and Tertullian were all using a similar

---

<sup>1</sup>Bailey, NT 17:294, n. 56, also finds in 1 Cor. 2:6-10 another poem but concludes that this is an original Pauline creation.

<sup>2</sup>Bailey, NT 17:274, n. 23.

<sup>3</sup>Rendel Harris, "Did Jesus Use Testimonies?," Expository Times 36 (1924), p. 412.

testimony, though Paul was nearer the Hebrew in his use of ἀπολῶ. Tertullian wrote regarding prophecies which showed that the Messiah would be temporarily unrecognized.<sup>1</sup> This is followed by the quotations from Isa. 29:14 and 6:9ff.<sup>2</sup> Harris' point is to link Justin's use of a longer quotation of Isa. 29:13-14 to Mark 7:6, which quotes vs 13 only and Paul who quotes vs 14. This testimony is supposedly an anti-Judaic remark which Harris then traces back to the use of Jesus Himself, of which Mark quotes the first part and Paul the second (See also Mt. 15:8 for Isa. 29:13). If there be a common apologetic testimony tradition behind this use by Paul and Mark it would be more convincingly presented along the lines laid down by Lindars and Dodd.<sup>3</sup> Paul, however, used the quotation in a different application than either Mark or Justin. It is more likely that both Justin and Clement have been influenced by Paul. This passage was undoubtedly part of early Christian apologetic and drawn from a shared tradition but the evidence put forth by Harris does not support his theory of a single testimony book.

---

<sup>1</sup>Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*. Books I-III, ed. and ET, Ernest Evans (Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1972), 4. iii. 6. (CC vol I, pp 514-5).

<sup>2</sup>Justin's quotation is as follows: Διὰ τοῦτο ἰδοὺ προθήσω τοῦ μεταθεῖναι τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον, καὶ μεταθήσω αὐτοὺς, καὶ ἀφελῶ τὴν σοφίαν τῶν σοφῶν, καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν τῶν συνετῶν αὐτῶν κρύψω.

<sup>3</sup>Lindars, NTA, p. 164, and Dodd, AS, p. 84.

κρύψω Replaced by ἀθετήσω. Various opinions have been given for the change from κρύψω to ἀθετήσω. The substitution differs from the LXX and from the Hebrew.<sup>1</sup> Unless one posits a text earlier than Paul which read ἀθετήσω, which is always a possibility, Eusebius of Caesarea is the earliest other witness to the reading.<sup>2</sup> If Paul himself made the change one must question why he chose a stronger expression to the alteration of the text from which he quotes.

Ἀθετέω is used only here in the Corinthian letters. Elsewhere it is used by Paul in Gal. 2:21; 3:15; 1 Thess. 4:8; 1 Tim. 5:12. In Galatians the word concerns the setting aside of τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ, where an idea similar to 1 Cor. 1:17 is present. The annulment of God's grace equals a vitiation of the worth of Christ's

---

<sup>1</sup>Toy, QNT, p. 169. The Isaiah Targum reads "hidden" (רמח). רמח is in chiasmic synonymous parallelism with the נר (perish) of the Targum as נר is with רמח of the MT thereby making the terms nearly synonymous. A similar synonymous relationship is seen between ἀπολῶ and ἀθετήσω in Paul.

<sup>2</sup>Eusebius, commentary on Isa. 29:14 reads: Ἐγὼ δὲ αὐτοὺς τῶν σοφῶν αὐτῶν τὴν σοφίαν ἀπολῶ, καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν τῶν συνετῶν ἀθετήσω, J.-P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca* (Petit-Montrange, 1857). Vol. 6, p. 300. Héring, 1 Cor., p. 8, attributes the change to either a memory slip or another translation. Also Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 45. Recently William F. Orr and James Arthur Walther, *I Corinthians* (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1976), p. 155, have ruled out a memory slip and hold that Paul deliberately altered the LXX. Toy, QNT, p. 169, reasons that Paul chose a stronger expression as does Lightfoot, NEP, p. 168. Lindars, NTA, p. 166, n. 1, leaves the question open.

death. In Gal. 3:15 the setting aside is related to a human covenant. 1 Thess. 4:8 relates to a disregard for God's approved concepts. The 1 Timothy reference concerns those young widows who have set aside their first faith. In all these uses the basic sense of the word is maintained and does not conflict with the meanings found in the papyri<sup>1</sup> or the LXX.<sup>2</sup>

If Paul selected the word, rather than copying it from an extant MS, he did so because it conveyed a concept more to his purpose.<sup>3</sup> What then is in the word that is more suited to Paul's line of thought? The word was capable of translating seventeen different Hebrew words in the LXX.<sup>4</sup> It must be pointed out, however, that ἀθετήσω never translates קָטַף in the LXX. Nor do the Hebrew word groups behind ἀθετήσω and κρύψω overlap in the LXX. Therefore the substitution of ἀθετήσω for κρύψω

---

<sup>1</sup>M&M, p. 12.

etc. (includes ἀθετέω)

<sup>2</sup>Christian Maurer, "τίθημι," from Theological Dictionary of the New Testament VIII (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972), p. 158, writes that "in the LXX τίθημι has strongly the character of willful repudiation of an institution and even more so of a person." See, for example, LXX Isa. 31:2 and Psalms 32:10.

<sup>3</sup>Atkinson, JTVI, pp. 40-41, says this "modification arose owing to inaccuracy of memory." While memory lapse is possible, the fidelity of the rest of the quotation to the LXX would make this to be a conclusion of only the last resort. Note the forms of τίθημι in Isa. 29:14a, διὰ τοῦτο ἰδοὺ προσθήσω τοῦ μεταθεῖναι τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον καὶ μεταθήσω αὐτούς . . . .

<sup>4</sup>M&M, p. 12.

cannot be accounted for on common semantic grounds. There is, however, a possible conceptual reason for the use of ἀθετήσω to be found in the word's association with wisdom in the LXX. Psalm 33:10 (LXX 32:10) is one example from which Paul may have drawn his conceptuality: κύριος διδάσκει δὲ νόμους, ἀθετεῖ δὲ λογισμοὺς λαῶν καὶ ἀθετεῖ βουλὰς ἀρχόντων.<sup>1</sup> This use of ἀθετεῖν matches Paul's general use of the term. Using Reider's index<sup>2</sup> one may conclude regarding a possible reading by α' σ' θ' that 1) ἀθετεῖν never translates יָהַד in the Three; 2) the Hebrew word groups do not overlap; 3) Paul does not show an early Palestinian Greek OT reading at this point.

Several positions have been held regarding these two words: 1) they are basically synonymous;<sup>3</sup> 2) ἀθετήσω is the more forcible,<sup>4</sup> 3) ἀθετήσω was chosen to adapt the quotation to its context.<sup>5</sup> There is, however, enough

---

<sup>1</sup>See also Prov. 11:3 LXX<sup>A</sup>.

<sup>2</sup>Joseph Reider and Nigel Turner. An Index To Aquila (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966). See S. Jellicoe's review "Aquila And His Version," Jewish Quarterly Review 59 (1968), pp. 326-332, for several cautions regarding the use of this index.

<sup>3</sup>Turpie, OTN, p. 147, displays an apologetic tendency to diminish possible differences between Paul and the OT.

<sup>4</sup>Gough, NTQ, p. 322. cf. Wuellner, JBL 89:201.

<sup>5</sup>Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 52. Bonsirven, EREP, p. 331, says that the change "accuse l'intention divine de rejeter la fausse sagesse."

evidence at least to merit consideration of a textual rather than an editorial solution. The MSS evidence for ἀθετήσω (564<sup>txt</sup>, 301 and Eusebius) is not considered by the above authors.

Harmonizations in 564 and 301. Due to the paucity and lateness of the Greek OT MSS evidence supporting Paul's reading the possibility of harmonization to Paul must be considered. Paul quoted from the book of Isaiah outside of 1 and 2 Cor. in Romans and Galatians. A study of these quotations gives no evidence of a tendency of 301 or 564 to conform to Pauline renderings of Isaiah.<sup>1</sup> However, the distinctiveness of Paul's reading of ἀθετήσω for κρύψω in 1 Cor. 1:19 may weigh in favor of a conformity of 564 and 301 to Paul. Eusebius shows Paul's reading. Eusebius used a hexaplaric type of text while 301 is Alexandrian and 564 is, at this point, mixed.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The evidence is as follows (Paul's variant is listed first): Ro. 9:33a σκανδάλου for πτώματι, 9:27 ὡς ἡ for ὡσεὶ, 301 only; 15:12 no variants; 9:33b καταισχυνησεται for καταισχυνηθή (Paul repeats this quotation in Ro. 11:8. Clement follows Paul in Ro. 11:34 where Isa. 28:16 is quoted but 564 does not.) 564 agrees with the main LXX witnesses in the rest of the Isa. passages and does not harmonize to Paul; Ro. 14:11; 2:24; 10:5; 15:21; Gal. 4:26; Ro. 11:26; 10:20f.

<sup>2</sup>(Zwitterstellung) GLXX Isa., p. 94. Regarding the catena groups cI and cII, Zeigler, GLXX Isa., p. 95, writes: "Wenn sich cI + cII von C trennen, dann geht C immer mit der hexaplarischen Rezension, cI + cII dagegen mit der alexandrinischen Textfamilie." In Isa. 29:14 the catena groups are not thusly divided and therefore must be considered to be mixed.



In 1 Cor. 2:16, while 564 agrees with Paul regarding συμβιβάσει it disagrees with him at three other places within the same quotation.<sup>1</sup> The GLXX groups 564 with 377 and 565, which also read συμβιβάσει. However, all the Catena groups follow this reading as well as major witnesses to the Hexaplaric (V Q<sup>mg</sup>), Alexandrian (A 106) and Lucianic (22<sup>C</sup>-55<sup>C</sup>) renderings showing a wide spread for this dialectical preference. One may conclude then, that this reading of 564 is also not a conformity to the text of 1 Cor. 2:16.

In 2 Cor. 6:17b, 564 disagrees with Paul and reads ἐξέλθετε for his ἐξέλθατε but agrees with his καί before ἀφορίσθητε. But this καί is also read by witnesses to the Alexandrian (Q), Hexaplaric (88 Syc), Lucianic (22<sup>C</sup> 93 456) groups and is therefore not a conformity to Paul in 564. Only when there is singular agreement with a weighty MSS witness to a particular type can a textual link be forged.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, 564 and 301 do not show a tendency to conform to Paul's variants from the LXX tradition and the possibility must remain open that Paul's

---

<sup>1</sup>564 reads καί for Paul's τις before ἔγνω; ϣ̄ for Paul's ὅς; αὐτῷ for his αὐτόν.

<sup>2</sup>As in the case with the quotation of Isa. 45:23 in Ro. 14:11 where the Alexandrian group alone agrees with Paul's reading of ἐξομολογήσεται. Ziegler, GLXX Isa., p. 25, writes: "Man könnte vermuten, dass von hier aus die HSS. beeinflusst waren. Jedoch bürgt die Vorzüglichkeit der alexandrinschen Gruppe für die Ursprünglichkeit dieser Lesarten." No Christian interpolation is seen in this case.

Greek OT read ἀθετήσω.

Fidelity to the OT Context. With this possible

textual base for the use of ἀθετήσω, the question as to the justice done to the OT context by the NT use of the quotation may now be answered. Because, as we have seen, this quotation was drawn from an OT passage which was used in several NT texts<sup>1</sup> it is interesting to see what became of its OT context.<sup>2</sup>

Both contexts concern the moral behavior of redeemed peoples. Lightfoot wrote that "the spirit of the application here is in exact accordance with the original context of the passage."<sup>3</sup> The people of Judah had become cold-hearted in their devotion to Yahweh. They denied God's central ownership over their lives.<sup>4</sup> The hardening work of God spoken of in Isa. 29:10 concerned a loss of wisdom and insight because of prolonged disobedience to God. Men who persisted in supporting themselves without the wisdom of God would not prosper.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 34.

<sup>2</sup>Jewish usage is seen in MR Lam., p. 112, where the demise of the righteous is seen to be more grievous than the curses of Dt. or the destruction of the Temple. Isa. 29:14 is then quoted on the basis of the three-fold occurrence of "wonder." Such an interpretation seems to view the wise in a positive rather than disparing light. In MR Ex. 5:14, Isa. 29:14 is quoted in response to the audacious remark of Pharaoh and his wise men that Yahweh was merely a son of the wise.

<sup>3</sup>Lightfoot, NEP, p. 158.

<sup>4</sup>Isa. 29:16.

<sup>5</sup>Isa. 29:14.



W. D. Davies provides an accurate summation of the New Testament context:

1 Cor. 1:17ff is not a polemic against specific persons or parties but against the Corinthian church as such, because, through its sophialehre it was confusing the Gospel with the philosophy and sophistry of its Hellenistic milieu and had thus come to misunderstand the nature of the gospel, of its own Christian leaders and of its own character.<sup>1</sup>

With this context in mind, Bonsirven's words are well taken: "Les savants actuels qui se complaisent dans leur vaine sagesse (1 Cor. 1,19) sont préfigurés par les sages qui reprend Isaïe (29,14)."<sup>2</sup> Paul had applied a principle drawn from OT history which was seen to be true for the Corinthians: man could not stand before God in his own deviant form of wisdom. Bonsirven classifies this as an example of typological exegesis.<sup>3</sup> Paul viewed this as a divine principle of action with specific reference to the methods of salvation derived by man.<sup>4</sup> The purpose of the quotation then was to provide God's opinion regarding those who stood on human sophistry rather than God's revelation.

Pauline Adaptations. This quotation finds its

---

<sup>1</sup>W. D. Davies, Christian Origins and Judaism (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1962), p. 185.

<sup>2</sup>Bonsirven, EREP, p. 329. Clemen, GAT, p. 189, sees the Christian condemnation of pretentious wisdom as a necessary and natural extension of the OT criticism of wisdom.

<sup>3</sup>Bonsirven, EREP, p. 329.

<sup>4</sup>Toy, QNT, p. 169.

dynamic in that the destruction of wisdom was brought about by the tragic demonstration of how wrong were the conclusions of human wisdom.<sup>1</sup> The physical destruction of Judah was secondary to the lesson taught that their wise men were, in truth, foolish.<sup>2</sup> Wuellner sees this quotation as stating the main theme of a homily Gattung adopted by Paul, and rightly points out that "the central theme of the homily with all its haggadic connotations is not that of wisdom as such, but the divine sovereignty and judgment over all wisdom."<sup>3</sup> Paul thus used this OT context as a keystone to nearly four chapters of argument against the grouping of Christian allegiance around human

---

<sup>1</sup>For a Synoptic concept of the selective and divinely promulgated hiddenness of the Messiah see Lk. 10:21-22 and Mt. 11:25-27. Fjärstedt, ST1C, pp. 145ff and 153, states, furthering his own thesis, that the wisdom/foolishness themes in 1 Cor. 1:17-2:16 were not based on the OT quotations but rather on the gospel tradition. The OT passages, says Fjärstedt, merely give a wider and richer scope. But the gospel tradition itself is based on the OT, and it is there that the wisdom/foolishness themes are sourced. Paul certainly wrote from a NT perspective but the OT remained his authority. The OT quotations were formulative to Paul's remarks to the Corinthians.

<sup>2</sup>Isa. 29:15ff.

<sup>3</sup>Wuellner, JBL, 89:201-02. The main theme of the homily is assertedly stated in 1 Cor. 1:19 concerning divine judgment on human wisdom. 1 Cor. 1:20-25 is then the first development of the theme from the prophets. 1 Cor. 1:26-31 is a second development using a Torah seder from either the creation, patriarchal or Exodus cycles. 1 Cor. 2:1-5 is a "characteristic digression." 1 Cor. 2:6ff is a third development from the prophets and writings while the eschatological section appears at the end, 1 Cor. 3:10-15. Conzelmann, NTS 12:238, assumes a more general Jewish wisdom motif in 1 Cor. 1:18ff.

figures.

The hermeneutical conceptuality underlying Paul's use of Isa. 29:14 becomes clear when one sees exactly what Paul was illustrating. The commonly held view is that the quotation illustrated the destruction of wisdom which vaunted itself before God but this can be more specifically defined. What triggered the quotation in Paul's mind was no doubt the divine judgment of wisdom motif in the OT and thus the quotation was intended for "those perishing" in the first part of 1 Cor. 1:18.<sup>1</sup> But Paul was not concerned with the meaning of such judgment for the wise but rather with its implications for the Corinthian believers. Thus the key to the underlying conception of the passage is found in the last half of vs 18.<sup>2</sup> A deep soteriological understanding was at work here. The quotation related σοφία to what God destroyed at the cross. The way of salvation had not come to the Corinthians by means of wisdom or signs, but rather by faith.<sup>3</sup> The questions of vs 21 were designed not to show the end of worldly wisdom in and of itself, but to show its replacement by the kerygma. Thus the emphasis is on the δύναμις θεοῦ revealed in the word of the cross which

---

<sup>1</sup>ὁ λόγος γὰρ ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῖς μὲν ἀπολλυμένοις μωρία ἐστὶ. . . .

<sup>2</sup>τοῖς δὲ σωζομένοις ἡμῖν δύναμις θεοῦ ἐστι.

<sup>3</sup>vss 21b; 24.

removed worldly wisdom in order to bring in faith.

It is doubtful that Paul conceived the Corinthian situation to be equal to that portrayed in Isa. 29. The Corinthians' hearts and lips were not far from God nor had God poured a deep sleep upon them.<sup>1</sup> The "wise" human leaders of Corinth could not compare with the rebellious wise and foolish men of the Judah of Isaiah's day. But the basis of the comparison is not found in a correspondence of the acts of the people in the Isaiah passage but in something more fundamental: their world view. It was not the people themselves who would be destroyed but their wisdom. This meant that their pattern and attitude to life would be shown to be in error because it deviated from the express will of God. Paul had been reminded of this situation by the self-seeking schisms in Corinth. If part of the problems were caused by Judaizers the analogy becomes more telling but Paul was quite clear in referring to the Greeks as well. Thus Paul illustrated the course the power of God in the cross took in providing salvation, especially noting the casualties, wisdom and foolishness.

The conceptuality is clear. For Paul, the God of the OT was the same as the God of the NT in His attitude towards autonomous human wisdom. Paul did not draw an

---

<sup>1</sup>Isa. 29:10, 14.

elaborate typology of historical event here but rather used words of divine authority to emphasize an ongoing and consistent divine attitude.

ISAIAH 40:13, 1 CORINTHIANS 2:16Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
-יֵם	τίς	τίς
		γάρ
יָכֵן	ἔγνω	ἔγνω
נוֹן-חָא	νοῦν	νοῦν
יְהוָה	κυρίου	κυρίου
	καί	
וְאֵי	τίς	
	αὐτοῦ	
יָחַז	σύμβουλος	
	ἐγένετο	
	ὅς	ὅς
יִדְּבַר	συμβιβᾷ	συμβιβάσει
	αὐτόν	αὐτόν

Romans 11:34: τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου;  
 ἢ τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο;

Masoretic Variants

BHS notes that the LXX with the Syriac and Vulgate reflect the reading וְאֵי חָא for וְאֵי.

Septuagintal Variants

For the first τίς the GLXX notes the addition of γάρ in Ro. 11:34 and 1 Cor. 2:16. Καί is read by Justin and η by 26 V 51<sup>c</sup> 87-91-309-490 377-564-565 49-764 403

407 538 Boh. Syropalastinian Clement of Alexandria and Hieronymus. Συμβουλος αυτου is read by Clement as in Romans but κ 26-86-106 B V 109-736-88 22-48-51-231-763 62-147 90-130-311 36-93-46-233 87-91-309-490 377-564-565 49-764 198 239-306 407 410 538 Eusebius Theodoret transpose the two words. 96 omits αυτου. 564 reads ω for ος. Συμβιβασει is read by κ<sup>a</sup> A+106 V - Q<sup>mg</sup>-88-109-736 22<sup>c</sup>-51<sup>c</sup> -90-36-93-233 87-91-309-409 377-564-565 49-764-566 198 393 403-613 407 410 (-σαι) 449-770 534 538 544 Justin Theodoret Cyril<sup>(lem)</sup> which agree with the Corinthian auotation. Αυτω is read for αυτον by 109-736 147 564. There is homoioteleuton with the αυτον of vs 14 in 106 490 410. Aquila reads εσταθμησατο πνευμα κυριου, 86. Symmachus reads quis paravit spiritum domini et virum consilii eius quis ostendit ei, Hi. Theodotion reads και ανηρ βουλην αυτου και εγνωρισεν αυτον, 86.

#### New Testament Variants

Tischendorf reads χριστου in vs 16b on the basis of κ A C D<sup>c</sup> E L P al omn<sup>vid</sup> e vg syr<sup>utr</sup> Coptic Armenian Pseudo-Justin Zen et ser<sup>8</sup> Or<sup>1,167.2,565.3,697</sup> etc. Lachmann reads κυριου with B D\* F G f g r Theophilus<sup>txt</sup> Augustine<sup>iob 3,632</sup> Ambrosiaster. This does not affect the quoted pericope, however, but does indicate some difference of thought regarding the use of χριστος for the κυριος of Isa. 40:13.

### Textual

Paul omitted the LXX phrase from the conjunction καί to ἐγένετο and reproduced the last part of the quote exactly.<sup>1</sup> Paul reads συμβιβάσει which is represented by the LXX κ<sup>a</sup> corrections, the Lucianic, Alexandrinus and several ninth, twelfth and thirteenth century texts.

Moulton supplies an orthographical reason for the change:

In LXX and occasionally in papyri and inscriptions we find a . . . future from stems in -αζω: thus ἐργᾶται from ἐργάζομαι. The absence of this in the NT is marked, and shows a dialectic distinction: thus in 1 Co 216 the LXX συμβιβᾷ is altered to συμβιβάσει.<sup>2</sup>

This indicates that Paul may have used a text conforming to this reading. The presence of συμβιβάσει is distinguished from the best Old Greek representative Q as well as from B. Q<sup>mg</sup> κ<sup>a</sup> A V and most Lucianic witnesses agree with Paul and may show an early Palestinian stratum behind the Lucianic recension.

### Contextual

In the OT the pericope is a part of an extended question in a section designed to display the surpassing

---

<sup>1</sup>The Isaiah Targum (Stenning) reads: מן הַקִּיִּין יְיָ רוח קודשא בפומ כל נבייא הלא יהוה. "Who hath directed the holy spirit in the mouth of all the prophets? Is it not the Lord?" Sperber, JBL 59:227, includes Isa. 40:13 as an example of a doublet in an asyndetic connection present in the Hexaplaric LXX text: καὶ τὸς αὐτοῦ σύμβουλος ἐγένετο// (// = a division of the doublet) ὃς συμβιβᾷ αὐτόν.

<sup>2</sup>Moulton, GNTG II, p. 187. Orr, 1 Cor., p. 159, calls this an Attic future.



greatness of Yahweh. The answer to the question of Isa. 40:18,<sup>1</sup> as with all the questions of Isa. 40:12-14 was "no one." Though no one was comparable<sup>2</sup> to Yahweh, this awesome contrast was designed to encourage rather than dismay as Isa. 40:29-31 shows. The contrast was intended to give men unshakeable confidence in Yahweh; to draw them to Him. As men were confronted with their own inability to direct God's Spirit and to counsel Him, they were brought to the crucial point of utter reliance upon Him.

In Corinthians, Paul drew a contrast between the world's and the Christian's way of knowing. He stressed the distinct medium of the Spirit as the conveyor of God's wisdom. The apologetic thrust had been to clarify why men who were caught up in their own pride and boasting (a description of the Corinthians, but tactfully focused on the rich and powerful in the κόσμος) were ignorant of all the good which God intended for them through Christ. Paul had shown that the Christian had a means of knowing God's mind.<sup>3</sup> In vs 14 Paul plainly

---

<sup>1</sup>"To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare unto him?" KJV

<sup>2</sup>On the subject from an OT perspective cf. C. J. Labuschagne, The Incomparability Of Yahweh In The Old Testament (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966). See especially the section "Rhetorical Questions," pp. 16-30.

<sup>3</sup>vss 10-15.

stated the inability of the ψυχικος to receive God's word. Because the spiritual man could know the things given through the Spirit of God, he was not subject to human evaluation. The quotation elaborates this last point.

### Hermeneutical

Pauline Adaptations. If Paul used an OT text with συμβιβάζει, which is most likely, it becomes a matter of direct quotation. If συμβιβάζει represents a change from the standard OT text it seems that Paul either had a memory lapse or purposely changed the spelling to conform to contemporary usage.

Paul omitted the central part of Isa. 40:13 from his quotation. Bonsirven classifies this among the condensed adaptations.<sup>1</sup> It is to be noted that Paul quoted from the Isa. 40:13 passage in Ro. 11:34, including the part of the verse he omitted here, but omitting the last part, thereby showing his knowledge of the verse in its entirety. One would assume, therefore, a purposeful alteration rather than a memory slip in 1 Cor. 2:16.<sup>2</sup> For Paul the τῷ αὐτοῦ σύμβουλος and ὃς συμβιβᾷ αὐτόν of the LXX both imply virtually the same sense and either one

---

<sup>1</sup>Bonsirven, EREP, p. 334.

<sup>2</sup>Lightfoot, Notes, p. 183. Cerfaux, KCP, p. 185, posits a florilegium in order to explain why Paul quoted differently in Ro. and 1 Cor. In Ro. Paul applied the passage to God.

could be excluded without obscuring the point of the quotation.<sup>1</sup>

Regarding Paul's adherence to the LXX even when dividing a verse, Hanson writes:

But he does not alter the text. His fidelity is shown in the fact that he will not alter the LXX's νοῦν κυρίου, although he must have known that the Hebrew had rūach, and πνεῦμα would have suited his argument better in 1 Cor. 2.<sup>2</sup>

Hatch writes that the usage of νοῦς rather than πνεῦμα is striking "because πνεῦμα would have followed more naturally from the preceding verses: and since this is the only passage in the LXX in which נִיח is translated νοῦς, the presumption is very strong that S. Paul had the LXX in mind."<sup>3</sup> On the contrary, νοῦς could not be more fitting for Paul's argument. The topic of the Spirit was only incidental to the purpose of Paul which was to mend the factions in the Corinthians' thinking, (ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες. . . ἦτε δὲ κατηρτισμένοι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοῦ καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ). This is the key to and the commencement of Paul's exposition in 2:16; unity around the

---

<sup>1</sup>Having omitted the part containing σύμβουλος, the ὅς lost its direct and proper antecedent but has its nearest antecedent in τίς; Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 51.

<sup>2</sup>Hanson, SPTT, p. 148.

<sup>3</sup>Hatch, Essays, p. 100. Davies, PRJ, p. 182, n. 6, writes that "Paul apparently equates πνεῦμα and νοῦς" which indicates his non-acceptance of a stoic metaphysic. Also Wendland, Kor., p. 27. Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 87, notes that Paul has in mind only the group of spiritual people when he says ἡμεῖς δέ.

mind of Christ.

To dwell on the mind/spirit relationship does not lead to a clearer understanding of the use of the passage. It is clear that Paul did not use a midrashic Gattung even though he quoted the first and last parts of Isa. 40:13 in 1 Cor. and the first and middle parts in Romans. This is a straightforward quotation, therefore an examination of the function of the γάρ of 1 Cor. 2:16 will help to explain the force of the quotation and show what words, if any, within the quotation are central.

The Functions of γάρ. Γάρ has both a grammatical and a syntactical function. As an IF its syntactical function is to prepare the reader for the introduction of the quotation. As a part of grammar its illative function relating to vs 15b must not be overlooked. Actually, the quotation itself functions as an illative by expanding, illustrating, or supporting its object. Thus the IF and quotation form one homogenous grammatical unit. Γάρ appears in many IF<sup>1</sup> and, being post-positive, is inevitably found within the actual quotation when γάρ comprises the entire IF. Such is the case in 1 Cor. 2:16 and this discussion will be limited to other such cases in Paul's works.<sup>2</sup> The grammatical function of the general use of

---

<sup>1</sup>See Ellis, PUOT, appendix II, pp. 156-85.

<sup>2</sup>This excludes Ro. 4:3 (τὸ γὰρ) ἡ γραφὴ λέγει; Ro. 12:19 γέγραπται γάρ; Ro. 13:9 τὸ γάρ; 2 Cor. 6:2 λέγει γάρ, etc.

particles for IF are used for specific reasons. For example the ἀλλά of Gal. 4:30 and the οὐ and ἀλλά of Gal. 3:16 show a definite adversative movement. The conclusive δὲ in Eph. 4:8 sharpens what would otherwise be blunted if a simple γάρ had been used. Even the common καθώς in 2 Cor. 3:15 and 9:9 retains much of its adverbial force. The five quotations which have γάρ as the IF<sup>1</sup> show a less formal relationship to the train of thought and are more integrated into the syntax than the other, more elaborate, IF. Notice in 1 Cor. 6:16 how the γάρ is syntactically separate from the φησίν. In Ro. 10:11 there is the λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή IF followed by three uses of γάρ, two in vs 12, one in vs 13. The vs 13 γάρ introduces OT scripture though grammatically this γάρ is indistinguishable from the preceding two. Thus, when used as an IF, the grammatical function of a particle is not lost.

Though the grammatical range may be somewhat limited due to the formalizing of the γάρ as an IF into a literary device, one can, however, find insight into the purpose in the mind of the author for selecting a particular IF. Paul's selection of γάρ shows he wanted to use the quotation in an illative sense.

The quotation itself implies what it did in Isaiah, that no one knows the mind of the Lord or is able

---

<sup>1</sup>Ro. 10:13; 11:34-35; 1 Cor. 6:16 (with φησίν); 10:26; 15:27.

to become His counsellor. What follows the quotation is a slightly adversative δέ indicating that what was not true in the quote is, in some way, true of the ἡμεῖς which follows. The Christian had been given the knowledge of God through the Spirit. The οὐδενός of vs 15 refers to the theme of human versus divine evaluation<sup>1</sup> in the sense that ultimately man was answerable to God alone.<sup>2</sup> The sense is that the spiritual man himself was above evaluation by men but not by God. Christ alone was the one who could evaluate. The point is that to judge a πνευματικώς is to judge God Himself; a very telling blow to those Corinthians who were full of judgmental factiousness. The γάρ and the quotation of vs 16 relate to an illative use explaining why no one appraises the πνευματικώς. The believer's participation with and submission to God's thoughts is hardly expressed more strongly elsewhere.

Summary. The emphasis of the quotation falls therefore not on the already clearly indicated participation in God's thoughts but on the concept of συμβιβάζει. The quotation does not announce that the Christian has the mind of God. That was done in vs 16b and had been already clearly intimated in vs 10ff. The quotation explained the absurdity of presumptuous eval-

---

<sup>1</sup>See 1 Cor. 4:3f.

<sup>2</sup>Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 41.

uation of men in Christ. So one must agree with Scroggs when he writes:

Paul has reserved his scriptural quotation until the end of the section as a climax (so also in verses 6-9), but the similarity in form of 11a and 16a suggests that Paul in 11a already had in mind his later use of Isa. xl.13.<sup>1</sup>

By omitting the middle section of Isa. 40:13

Paul compressed the verse and placed the emphasis on the verb συμβιβάσει rather than on the noun σύμβουλος as in the Romans passage. Paul brought together the two concepts of the high position of the believer and the inability of men to evaluate divine things. The climax, however, is found in vs 16b. The quotation provides only a small part of the progression of thought begun in 2:6.

The historical contexts of the Old and New Testaments are compatible. The Isaiah context concerns the inability of man to direct God's thoughts and actions. This should have caused man to trust in Yahweh over idols. The Corinthian context draws the principle that a man apart from the Spirit is not to presume to judge God's work among His people. More precisely, the gulf between the πνευματικοί and the ψυχικοί is widely drawn; there could be no understanding of the former on the part of the latter, therefore there can be no evaluation either. Ability to judge the worth of, for example, Paul's

---

<sup>1</sup>Scroggs, NTS 14:53.

ministry, was directly related to one's receptivity to the mind of Christ in the Spirit. In both contexts the particular passage carries the same sense.



ISAIAH 45:14, 1 CORINTHIANS 14:25Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
ⲓⲕ	ὅτι	ὅτι
		ὁντως
	ἐν	
ⲓⲛ	σοί	
	ὁ	ὁ
ⲓⲕ	θεός	θεός
		ἐν
		ὕμῳ
	ἐστίν	ἐστίν

Masoretic Variants

BHS lists no variants for this passage.

Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX shows that ετι is added to εν σοι by 109-736 and omitted by 544. The article before θεος is not present in 147 87-91-309-490 A-564 239-306 403-613 449-770 Theodoret. σ' reads μονον εν σοι θεος και ουκ εστιν ετι ουδ' υπα<sup>ρ</sup>χει θεος. α' reads πλην εν σοι ισχυρος. θ' reads πλην εν σοι ισχυρος.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that οντως is before (ο) θεος in ⲕ A B D E F G al fere<sup>10</sup> it. vg syr<sup>sch</sup> cop arm aeth go Or<sup>cat</sup> 245 and int bis Did<sup>tri</sup> 230 Chr<sup>6,614</sup> Euthal<sup>cod</sup>

Amb<sup>100</sup> <sup>luc</sup> 2. It is after ο θεος in K L and others, syr<sup>P</sup>  
 Bas <sup>3,30</sup> Chr<sup>388.390.392</sup> Thrt<sup>d</sup> Dam. N\* D\* F G 109\* Or<sup>cat</sup>  
 Chr<sup>388.390.392</sup> have θεος without the article while N<sup>c</sup> B  
 D<sup>b,c</sup> E K L and <sup>most</sup> others Did<sup>tri</sup> Bas Chr<sup>6,614</sup> Thrt<sup>d</sup> and Dam  
 read ο θεος.

### Textual

Grosheide is correct that this is an allusion. Even though the text is quoted informally it may be located in the OT at Isa. 45:14.<sup>1</sup> Paul's use of ὄντως better represents the Hebrew than the LXX.<sup>2</sup> The Isaiah Targum reads: בקושטא בִּיךְ אֱלֹהֵא.<sup>3</sup>

### Contextual

Isa. 45:15 speaks of the praise that would come to Israel from foreign nations when Israel was reestablished. As a result of divine power behind Cyrus, God's name would be recognized to be active within Israel.

The NT context concerns the convicted utterances

---

<sup>1</sup>Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 333. Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 133, sees it as a quotation. Toy, QNT; Gough, NTQ; Turpie, OTN do not include it. Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 327, indicates that Paul may have had in mind 1 Ki. 18:39. Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 287, n. 33, suggests Dan. 2:47, Isa. 45:14, or Zech. 8:23. See also Wendland, Kor., p. 113.

<sup>2</sup>Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek (Cambridge and London: Macmillan and Co., 1881, Appendix III, p. 181ff.

<sup>3</sup>"Of a truth God is in thee. . . ." Stenning, Isa. Targum, p. 154.

of the one who, by means of prophecy, was brought to the realization that God was indeed among those who were formerly thought of as being provincial babblers.

### Hermeneutical

Paul did not use the passage in any formal way as indicated by its lack of an IF and general syntactical framework. It is certainly not merely a verbal coincidence, however, and indicates that either this phrase had become a religious cliché or that Paul remembered this OT context and realized its suitability for his argument. This latter is decidedly to be preferred when one, apparently unnoticed, fact is observed.

In 1 Cor. 14:21f a group of unbelievers were seen to be repulsed by glossolalia with the result that they mocked the community. In both the OT and NT contexts of the quoted OT passage an act of God had the effect of hardening men in unbelief. Also, in 1 Cor. 14:25, the OT and NT contexts concerned an act of God which brought men to confess His greatness. In the OT this act was Israel's reestablishment. In the NT it was the act of Christian prophecy but the results were similar in that both groups of men glorified God. Thus the quotations in 1 Cor. 14:21 and 14:25, both from Isaiah, show a contrast which was very much a part of the experience of the early church: the rejection of God's message by Israel (1 Cor. 14:21)

and its reception by the nations (1 Cor. 14:25). This is even more clear given the Pauline conception of the Church as the New Israel and the recipient of the ancient promises. While one would not assert that the readers would have been alert to the connection between these two OT passages, the link was clearly a part of Paul's conceptuality and meditation on the place of glossolalia in the early Church.

ISAIAH 49:8, 2 CORINTHIANS 6:2Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
כח	οὕτως	
אמר	λέγει	λέγει
יהוה	κύριος	γάρ
בעב	καιρῷ	καιρῷ
רצון	δεκτῷ	δεκτῷ
עניתיך	ἐπήκουσά	ἐπήκουσά
	σου	σου
	καί	καί
	έν	έν
וביום	ἡμέρᾱ	ἡμέρᾱ
ישועה	σωτηρίας	σωτηρίας
עזרתך	ἐβοήθησά	ἐβοήθησά
	σοι	σοι

Masoretic Variants

BHS lists no variants for this passage.

Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX notes that 233 reads ταδε for ουτως. 538 and Coptic adds the ο θεος (αγιος, Bohairic) τω (του, Coptic) ισραηλ from Isa. 49:7 while Clement adds ο ρυσσμενος ισραηλ from Isa. 49:7. Augustine adds Israel. K\* alone reads σου for σοι and 147 reads δε. α' and Origen read εν καιρω ευδοκίας, Chr.

### New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that λέγει γὰρ καιρῷ is read by  $\kappa$  B C D<sup>b</sup> and <sup>c</sup> E K L P al fere omn (sed 37. διο λέγει καιρῷ) f vg. syr<sup>utr</sup> sah Cop. καιρῷ γὰρ λέγει is read by D\* F G d e g go Sedul. F replaces σοι by σου.

### Textual

Paul reproduced the LXX tradition with only the possible deletion of κύριος if λέγει γὰρ is not seen as an IF. Λέγει is equivalent to quotation marks when used without a subject and is a common form of quotation.<sup>1</sup> We take λέγει γὰρ as the IF therefore Paul's quotation begins after the λέγει κύριος of the LXX.

### Contextual

In Isa. 49 the prophet is seen to be giving a divine vindication for his ministry. Though his mission was not yet accomplished and Israel was not then gathered<sup>2</sup> God would still glorify Himself through His servant. Isaiah was promised that he would be a light to the Gentiles,<sup>3</sup> an object of worship of kings and princes,<sup>4</sup> and a covenant of deliverance for the earth.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See Ro. 15:10; Eph. 4:8.

<sup>2</sup>Isa. 49:5.

<sup>3</sup>Isa. 49:6.

<sup>4</sup>Isa. 49:7.

<sup>5</sup>Isa. 49:8.

In 2 Cor. 6 Paul exhorted his readers not to receive the grace of God in vain. This exhortation was based on the preceding words of 2 Cor. 5 where the reconciling work of God was explained. The Corinthians were to follow the example of their ministers in bringing full glory to their works by taking full advantage of the grace offered them.

### Hermeneutical

2 Cor. 6:2b As a Comment on vs 2a. It is possible that the whole of 2 Cor. 6:2 was a quotation from a previous source due to its inclusion in a parenthetical manner.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand the latter part of vs 2 is best seen as an interpretation of the quotation much along the lines of the peshar type of exegesis commonly found at Qumran.<sup>2</sup> Paul very plainly stated that the present was a day of salvation and acceptableness but it is not convincing to hold that he identified the day spoken of in reference to Isaiah with the present time of his readers. One would expect that Paul, if he had been seeking to make a peshar interpretation would have utilized the article of reference before *καὶρός* and *ἡμέρα* in his commentary of 2 Cor. 6:2b. As it is, Paul left his exposition as indefinite as the quotation. His use of

---

<sup>1</sup>Ellis, PUOT, p. 143, n. 3.

<sup>2</sup>Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 211.

νῦν pinpoints the time of another day of salvation, most likely with reference to the existent church age,<sup>1</sup> the time intervening between the date of the letter and the return of Christ. The νῦν has the content and quality (anarthrous καίρος and ἡμερά) of a day of salvation, not necessarily the day spoken of in Isa. Another indication that the commentary is not a strict pesher is the use of εὐπροσδέκτος. This strengthened form implies that the present was a "very good" time. If the time of Isaiah's aid was δέκτος then the time of God's grace in Christ was termed εὐπροσδέκτος.<sup>2</sup>

Pauline Adaptations. Whether the Apostle or someone else wrote the commentary on the quotation, the OT passage itself was used by Paul to point out a similarity of then and now in God's work of aiding mankind.<sup>3</sup> The

---

<sup>1</sup>See Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 191. Acts 17:30. Bruce, P&J, p. 65, stresses that Paul's understanding of God's salvific acts was no "mere theological scheme, intellectually constructed," but rather an experiential fact of life which gave shape to Paul's mission to the Gentiles. Paul's νῦν is a clear example of the γραφή drawing its meaning from the present. This was part and parcel of the rabbinic method; a method which could be used to secure radically differing results. Dietzfelbinger, PAT, p. 35, writes that "das Verständnis des καίρος geht also sowohl bei Paulus als auch im Spätjudentum der Vergegenwärtigung der γραφή voraus, setzt sie erst in Gang und bestimmt sie in ihrem Inhalt und ihrem Ergebnis."

<sup>2</sup>Qumran has preserved the sense of good will in the Hymn Scroll, Hymn Z vss 14-15: "Thou alone hast created the just and established him from his mother's womb unto the time of good will that he may be presented in Thy Covenant. . . ." See Dupont-Sommer, EWQ, p. 246.

<sup>3</sup>Bultmann, 2 Kor., p. 169, notes "Mit der rabbinischen Exegese aber stimmt Paulus überein, wenn er das



day that God acts for the benefit of man was man's day of salvation. The simile carries with it the sense of God's sovereign choice of the day in which He would act, therefore this element of the quotation was elaborated by the apostle as a basis for exhortation. The Isaiah Targum also makes the passage contemporary in its exhortation:

Thus saith the Lord, at the time that ye do my pleasure I will receive your prayer, and in the day of distress I will raise up salvation, . . .<sup>1</sup>

If God had chosen a time to bring aid to man, who was man to disregard the offer or be tardy in making full use of it? Indeed it was the thought of receiving the grace of God in vain<sup>2</sup> that prompted the mention of the OT passage in the first place. Paul used the passage to substantiate his exhortation.<sup>3</sup>

This is an example of the IF introducing the word of God. The OT passage was spoken by Yahweh. The LXX reads λέγει κύριος but this did not find its way into the λέγει κύριος saying of the NT, possibly in this case because Paul equated the LXX κύριος in the passage with

---

Wort textgemäss als eschatologische Weissagung der Heilstat auffasst." J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit OT Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the NT," New Testament Studies 7 (1960-61), p. 316, also views this quotation as a "modernization" of an OT text to a current situation.

<sup>1</sup>Stenning, TI, p. 166.      <sup>2</sup>1 Cor. 6:1.

<sup>3</sup>Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 190, conjectures that "the passage may have occurred to St. Paul because of the resemblance of his own case to that of the Prophet."

his θεοῦ of 2 Cor. 6:1, 4 rather than Christ. Here again is seen the identification of the Church with the true Israel. The recipient of grace in the OT passage was Israel but with Paul it has become the Church. The continuity of God's responses to His chosen people is again part of Paul's conceptuality.

ISAIAH 49:13, 2 CORINTHIANS 7:6Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
		ἀλλ'
		ὁ
		παρακαλῶν
- כ'י	ὅτι	
נבנ	ἠλέησεν	
	ὁ	
יהי'	θεός	
	τόν	
יחג	λαόν	
	αὐτοῦ	
	καί	
	τούς	τούς
י'יג'י	ταπεινούς	ταπεινούς
	τοῦ	
	λαοῦ	
	αὐτοῦ	
נבג'	παρεκάλεσεν	παρεκάλεσεν
		ἡμᾶς
		ὁ
		θεός

Masoretic Variants

BHS lists no variants for this section.

### Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX notes that Eus. demonstratio evangelica reads κυριος for ο θεος and that the second αυτου is omitted by Q<sup>txt</sup>-26 449-770 and the Bohairic.

### New Testament Variants

Tischendorf lists no variants for this section.

### Textual

This passage is a clear allusion rather than a quotation. It finds its affinities with the OT passage in the combination of the use of the verb παρακαλέω, ο θεός, and τούς ταπεινούς.

### Contextual

The OT context is the same as for the quotation in 2 Cor. 6:2. Here the Lord has brought the restoration of His creation and comfort to His people. Paul, in his context, was defending himself and showing that he was truly concerned about the Corinthians. One such demonstration was his reaction to the news which Titus brought from Corinth.

### Hermeneutical

The OT passage was used in a proverbial manner.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Isa. 49:13 is used in the Mekilta, Shirata on Ex. 15:7-8, Luterbach, Mek. II, p. 53, to refer to the earth rejoicing over the redemption of Israel.

What, in Isa. 49:13, was a description of the Acts of God in a particular historical situation became in 2 Cor. 7:6 a general description of the character of God signifying His customary response to the meek, or, more to Paul's point, to the meek of believing Israel. The transference of God's actions upon Israel to those upon the Church is a common occurrence and here again Paul identified himself and his co-workers<sup>1</sup> with the people<sup>2</sup> of the Isaiah passage. The continuity of deity is clear. Continuity of piety is implied in the adoption of ταπεινούς for the Christian community.

---

<sup>1</sup>ἡμᾶς.

<sup>2</sup>τοῦ λαοῦ, LXX.

ISAIAH 55:10 AND HOSEA 10:12, 2 CORINTHIANS 9:10

Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
<u>Isaiah 55:10</u>	<u>Isaiah 55:10</u>	
		ὁ
		δέ
יְנוּן	δῶ	ἐπιχορηγῶν
גִּרְזִי	σπέρμα	σπέρμα
גִּרְזִיל	τῶ	τῶ
סִפְרוּ	σπεύροντι	σπεύροντι
לְכֹל	καί	καί
	ἄρτον	ἄρτον
	εἰς	εἰς
	βρώσιν	βρώσιν
		χορηγήσει
		καί
		πληθυνεῖ
		τόν
		σπόρον
		ὕμῶν
		καί
		αύξησει
		τά
<u>Hosea 10:12</u>	<u>Hosea 10:12</u>	
	ἕως	
קִיבִי-טַי	τοῦ ἐλθεῖν	

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
<u>Hosea 10:12</u>	<u>Hosea 10:12</u>	
הררי	γενήματα	γενήματα
		της
קדץ	δικαιοσύνης	δικαιοσύνης
ככל	ὕμιν	ὕμων

### Masoretic Variants

BHS lists no variants for the Isa. passage and neither does BHK for the Hosea pericope.

### Septuagintal Variants

#### Isa. 55:10

Δωσει is read for δω by A-26 (δυση) and 198.

σπειραντι is read by the Lucianic sub-group 62-147-233 91 544 and Justin.

#### Hos. 10:12

The GLXX notes that 130-311 of the Catena sub-group read ου ελθειν while Q\*-198 and Cyr of the Alexandrian group read ου ελθη. The Lucianic sub-group 46-86-711 with La<sup>S</sup> Bo Syh Th. Tht. Spec. transpose γεν δικ/ὕμιν but the main Lucianic groups 22-36-48-51-231-719-763 and 62-14 read ὕμιν δικ γεν. B 130-311-239-613 410 read ημιν while 106 and Aeth read ὕμων.

### New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that σπερμα is read by κ C D <sup>b</sup> et c E K L P al fere omn Chr <sup>682</sup> Cyr glaph <sup>228</sup> Euthal cod

Thdrt Dam. Σπορον is read by B D\* F G 80. <sup>me</sup> ~~me~~ 4,26 et 27  
 βαλη τον <sup>π</sup>σπορον, και ο σπορος βλαστα; Lk 8,5 et 11 του  
 σπειραι τον σπορον αυτου et ο σπορος εστιν non fluctuant,  
 nec magis quod subsequitur πληθυνει τον σπορον υμων.  
 Propterea σπερμα h. l. non a lectione Esaiae, <sup>, aliena manu derivatum puto.</sup> L 37 47  
 read τω σπειρ<sup>ο</sup>αντι for τω σπειρουντι. <sup>\*</sup>κ B C D\* P  
 (αυξησει et. F G) al <sup>15</sup> d e f g r vg cop arm aeth Cyr  
 glaph 228 (et esa <sup>86</sup>) Euthal cod Cyp <sup>240</sup> Aug op. mon.  
 Ambrst al read χορηγησει, πληθυνει (c-νη) αυξησει.  
 Χορηγησαι, πληθυναι, αυξησαι are read by <sup>(sed vide de his ante)</sup> X<sup>C</sup> D<sup>C</sup> F gr Ggr<sup>1</sup>  
 K L al longe plu go Chr Cyr esa <sup>430</sup> (επευχεται λεγων)  
 Thrdt Dam al. Male h. l. ut toties alibi exscrip<sup>si</sup>t E  
 lectiones codicis D, ita ut daret χορηγησεαι et αυξησεαι,  
 notato utroque loco <sup>ε</sup> ~~ε~~, recte vero ex D<sup>C</sup> πληθυναι sumpsit.  
 κ B C D E F G K L P al ut <sup>vi</sup> plu (11 ap Scri, plus etiam  
 ap Mtthaei) Euthal cod Chr <sup>mos</sup> <sup>c</sup> ~~ε~~ <sup>2</sup>, nec aliter Cyr glaph 228  
 et esa <sup>86</sup> (non item esa <sup>430</sup>) read γεννηματα. Cf. et.  
 syr P mg gr γεννηματα. Γεννηματα cum minusc vix mu, item  
 ut editi sunt Chr Thdrt Dam al.

### Textual

There is no need to give a highly detailed comparison of how Paul conflated the OT passages because of the lack of both an IF and, therefore, a lack of specific appeal to biblical authority.<sup>1</sup> But the Isa. passage is nearly exactly quoted, <sup>†</sup>the only difference being Paul's

---

<sup>1</sup>Barrett, 2 Cor., p. 239.



reading of ἐπιχορηγῶν for δῶ.

### Contextual

#### Isa. 55:10

The immediate context is the great invitation to the banquet of Yahweh.<sup>1</sup> The Davidic promises would be fulfilled<sup>2</sup> but men must still seek the Lord in repentance. The passage which Paul quoted was illustrative of how God's word would permeate its object and achieve its end just as the rain permeates the earth achieving the sustenance to him who sows and eats.

#### Hos. 10:12

The broad context is that of impending judgment on the Northern Kingdom. The immediate context concerns the judgment on Ephraim.

The Corinthian context is the same as for the Prov. 22:8, 2 Cor. 9:9 quotation.

### Hermeneutical

Isa. 55:10 was used in MR<sup>3</sup> regarding the heavenly origin of all things. It is again used in MR<sup>4</sup> to argue that all was created from the earth alone. Paul used the quotation in quite a different way. Menzies suggests that these OT texts had been previously used in Paul's way "among people who regarded almsgiving as a principal

---

<sup>1</sup>Isa. 55:1.

<sup>2</sup>Isa. 55:3.

<sup>3</sup>MR Ecc1., p. 107.

<sup>4</sup>MR Gen., p. 97.

means of grace."<sup>1</sup> It is not evident, however, that the Corinthians were having such a problem nor would Paul let such a problem go without specific mention and correction. At any rate, what Paul spoke of was not the source of righteousness but its fruit (γενήματα, vs 10). The offering was continually called a ministry (διακονία) rather than a righteousness. Paul took the physical aspects of the Isa. 55 passage and used them in a figurative way to describe the manner in which God would cause the Corinthians to abound in good works. Paul's point was that the Corinthians must see that God would provide for them even when they gave up their goods to others. God would not only give them seed (material goods) to give away but would also put bread on their tables to meet their own daily needs.

Regarding σπέρμα and σπόρον Plummer writes that the distinction is important. He sees the former to be literal seed but σπόρον "used of the gifts which must be scattered generously, and which God will supply and augment."<sup>2</sup> There is no such distinction inherent within the words. They were used interchangeably in Philo<sup>3</sup> and

---

<sup>1</sup>Menzies, 2 Cor., p. 67.

<sup>2</sup>Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 263.

<sup>3</sup>Siegfried Schulz and Gottfried Quell, "σπέρμα," from Theological Dictionary of the New Testament VII (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1971), pp. 543-44.

virtually always translate  $\gamma\alpha\rho$  in the LXX. In Paul both words are used synonymously and both show a preference for the figurative sense.<sup>1</sup> This use by Paul is methodologically the same as in Isa. 55 where the rain and its effects were figures of the productive word of God. In both places the seed and bread are figures or illustrations of the effectual provisions of God. The actions of God are in Isa. 55 related to the surety of His saving work with Israel whereas the actions of God in 2 Cor. 9:10 result in the increase of righteous deeds by the believers. The Hosea passage is an allusion to the context of sowing and reaping of righteous deeds. The words in Paul's quotation may only have a fortuitous similarity.<sup>2</sup>

The Isa. passage does not attribute the provisions of rain and harvest to Yahweh but Paul has used it ascriptively of God. This is an OT phrase which had become a religious cliché. The combination with Hosea 10:12 furthered the agricultural motif begun by Paul in 2 Cor. 9:6. Both passages are theologically charged. Hosea used the farming imagery with reference to moral living after repentance. Isa. used the divinely ordained

---

<sup>1</sup>Schulz, TDNT VII, pp. 545-46.

<sup>2</sup>Chaim Rabin, The Zakokite Documents (Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1954), p. 3. See ZD 1:11 for a messianic interpretation which was apparently unknown to Paul.

processes of nature to illustrate the effectiveness of God's utterances. This was also within the context of repentance followed by God's promised blessing. Both passages relate to the nation Israel. While not a chain quotation, these passages follow upon Paul's quotation of Psa. 112:9 in 2 Cor. 9:9 and are directly related to it in the sowing and righteousness motifs as well as in the general 2 Cor. context of aiding the poor. 2 Cor. 9:10 is therefore a wish, based on Scriptural concepts, that the Corinthians would recognize God's ongoing provision for them and respond to that by freely sharing their goods.

ISAIAH 64:4 (64:3 MT), 1 CORINTHIANS 2:9Textual Display<sup>1</sup>

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
<u>Isa. 64:3</u>	<u>Isa. 64:4</u>	
םליומי		καθώς
יגמש-אל	ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος	γέγραπται
אל	<u>οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν</u>	ᾧ
ינ'יזקה	οὐδέ	
י'ג	οἱ <u>ὀφθαλμοι</u>	<u>ὀφθαλμός</u>
ההאר-אל	ἡμῶν	οὐκ
םילהא	<u>εἶδον</u>	<u>εἶδεν</u>
ההלול	θεόν	καί
השג'	πλήν	οὕς
ול-המכחל	σοῦ	<u>οὐκ ἤκουσεν</u>
<u>Isa. 65:16</u>	καί	καί
וכי	τά	ἐπι
והנהנ	ἔργα	καρδιάν
י'גמי	σου	ἀνθρώπου
		οὐκ
<u>Jer. 3:16</u>		ἀνέβη
אלי	<u>ᾧ ποιήσεις</u>	<u>ὅσα ἠτοίμασεν</u>
הלג'		ὁ θεός
בל-לג	<u>τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν</u>	<u>τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν</u>

---

<sup>1</sup>The underlinings show affinities between LXX & NT.

MTLXXNTIsa. 64:4

ἔλεον

αὐτόν

Isa. 65:16: . . . και οὐκ ἀναθήσεται αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν  
καρδίαν. . . .

Jer. 3:16 . . . οὐκ ἀναθήσεται ἐπὶ καρδιαν. . . .

Masoretic VariantsIsa. 64:4 (:3 MT)

BHS notes the LXX plural of ηκουσαμεν and suggests יִזְכּוּ הַיְיָ as the Hebrew underlying Paul's quotation.<sup>1</sup>

Isa. 65:16

BHS lists no variants.

Jer. 3:16

BHS lists no variants.

Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX shows that A\* alone omits θεον πλην σου. 564 omits θεον. The Hexaplaric sub-group 109-736 omits the σου after εργα. In place of α 22-48-51-231-763 62-147 90-130-311 36-93-96 -233 403-613 544 770 and Theodoret read αληθινα και. 534 and possibly 565 read ποιεις for

---

<sup>1</sup>Joseph Ziegler, "Die Vorlage der Isaias - Septuaginta (LXX) Und Die Erste Isaias-Rolle Von Qumran (1 QIs<sup>a</sup>)," Journal of Biblical Literature 78 (1959), p. 50, gives a word of warning which applies here: "An den meisten Stellen forderte der griechische Stil, nicht die hebräische Vorlage, die mit Q übereinstimmende Wiedergabe."

ποιησεις. 22-48-51-231-763 62-147 90-130-311 36-93-96  
-233 538 770 and Theodoret follow υπομενουσιν with δε  
while 106 and the Sahidic add σοι. Ελεος is read by 86\*-  
106 147-233 198 239-306 403-613 407 538 544: cf. 16:5.  
Τον ελεον is read by 565. σ' reads τοις προσδοκωσιν  
αυτον. The three read οφθαλμος ουκ ιδεν (Q) for ουδε-  
ειδον.

Isa. 65:16

Αυτων is transposed with επι την καρδιαν in 106  
22-48-51-231-763 36-93-96 the Syrohexapla and Hieronymus.  
Homoioteleuton occurs with the καρδιαν of vs 17 in 90-130  
-311.

Jer. 3:16

Ουκ is preceded by ουτι in 26 239 410 544 Sahidic  
and by et in the Arabic Armenian which equals MT; ουδε μη  
is read by Pseudo-Chrysostom. Εις is given for επι by  
Pseudo-Chrysostom. Theodoret reads καρδιαν. Την καρδιαν  
αυτων is given by Q, Pseudo-Chrysostom, Sahidic plus the  
Bohairic. 26 adds αυτων; the Arabic adds υμων.

New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that <sup>χ</sup> A B D E F G L etc. read  
ειδεν while C P etc. read ιδεν. <sup>ει</sup> α <sup>ητοιμασεν</sup> is read by (P<sup>46</sup> Nestle)  
κ D E F G L P al omn<sup>vid</sup>, Polyc<sup>mart</sup> 393 Clem<sup>625.659</sup>  
Or<sup>2,564.809</sup> et<sup>3,361</sup> Const<sup>7,32,2</sup> etc. Item quae d e f g r  
vg Or<sup>int</sup> 1,154 et<sup>2,300.667</sup> et<sup>3,44</sup> etc. οσα is read by A  
B C<sup>vid</sup> Clem<sup>ro80</sup> (-οσα ητοιμασεν τοις υπομενουσιν αυτον) al.

## Textual

Past Efforts to Locate the Source of the Quotation. The location of the precise Old Testament passage or passages which Paul quotes has presented a continual problem for interpreters. Their conclusions may be classed under three headings. The first is that the quotation was not taken from the OT.

An Extra-biblical Source. J. A. Fitzmyer offers this quotation as an example of the "use of well-known introductory formulas to cite a passage which is not found in the Old Testament."<sup>1</sup> Origen, in his commentary on Mat. 27:19, identifies the Apocalypse of Elijah as Paul's source.<sup>2</sup> Hammerton-Kelly<sup>3</sup> favors a lost Jewish Apocalypse as the source. Resch sees the authoritative source behind Paul's quote to be a word of the Lord.<sup>4</sup>

Of Indeterminate Origin. The second position asserts that the source of Paul's quotation is not

---

<sup>1</sup>Fitzmyer, NTS 7:304. See also Bertil E. Gärtner, "The Pauline and Johannine Idea of 'To Know God' against the Hellenistic Background," New Testament Studies 14 (1967), p. 215, who avows that the quotation is "certainly not from the Old Testament."

<sup>2</sup>Johannis Drusius, TA IEPA ΠΑΡΑΛΛΗΛΑ (Franekeræ: Exeudebat Aegidius Radacus, 1588), p. 115, also.

<sup>3</sup>Hammerton-Kelly, PWSM, p. 114.

<sup>4</sup>Resch, Ag., pp. 27; 110. But this is effectively refuted by Pierre Prigent, "Ce que l'oeil n'a pas vu, 1 Cor. 2,9," Theologische Zeitschrift 14 (1958), pp. 423-24.



recoverable. Ellis notes this as one of a group of passages which can be described as "merely quotations of substance whose source is conjectural."<sup>1</sup>

Free Rendering of Isa. 64:4. The third major position is that Paul freely rendered the Isa. 64:4 passage. Toy asserts<sup>2</sup> that Paul only took the general concept from Isaiah.<sup>3</sup>

According to Héring the IF "must introduce a textual quotation" though Isa. 64:4 only has a slim correspondence.<sup>4</sup> Grosheide and Barrett also hold that the quotation was from the OT but that its exact location is unknown.<sup>5</sup> Barrett favors Isa. 64:4 and 65:16 and concludes that Paul either had a text differing from the MT

<sup>1</sup>Ellis, PUOT, p. 35. Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 39, states that the IF implies a source from an authoritative work "but the document cannot be identified." Wendland, Kor., p. 24, also pleads ignorance as to the source.

<sup>2</sup>Toy, QNT, p. 171. Randolph, TPNT, p. 31, in characteristic fashion, finds the sense agreeable to the Hebrew Isaiah, excludes an apocryphal source due to the IF, and concludes that the Hebrew text was probably corrupted by Jewish influences and that Paul found his reference in a "more correct copy." Gough, NTQ, p. 323, echoes Randolph.

<sup>3</sup>Johnson, QNT, p. 152, locates the quotation in Isa. 52:15, and says it is "identical with the quotation in sense and similar to it in language."

<sup>4</sup>Héring, 1 Cor., p. 18. Also Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 41. It is noteworthy that in classics one finds that a purposely free quotation of material was a kind of "sign of mastery" over the source. cf. Stendahl, SSM, p. 157.

<sup>5</sup>Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 66 and Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 73.

or inaccurately quoted from memory. Robertson<sup>1</sup> concludes that Isa. 64:4 was the source of the quotation and states that "Paul quotes with great freedom, often compounding different passages and altering words to suit his purpose."<sup>2</sup>

Commenting on Isa. 64:4, Jerome disagrees with Origen's conclusions regarding the Apocalypse of Elijah being Paul's source and notes that the passage also occurs in the Ascension of Isaiah. Epiphanius, in Heresies 42, states that the Apoc. of Elijah quotes also from Eph. 5:14. This immediately raises the probability of the use of 1 Cor. 2:9 as well. Also, the Isa. 64:4 quotation is only present in the Latin Ascension of Isaiah, which is a later work.<sup>3</sup> The quotation is absent from the earlier Ethiopic version which itself also underwent Christian redaction. Lightfoot<sup>4</sup> dates the Apoc. of Elijah and the Ascension of Isaiah in the second century.

Another recent contender for the source of the quotation has been the Testament of Jacob, but here again

---

<sup>1</sup>Robertson, 1 Cor., pp. 41-42. See also Clement of Rome (34.8).

<sup>2</sup>Ellis, PUOT, p. 35, notes 1-4, provides an overview of the past research into the quotation's source. See also Feuillet, TD 14:145.

<sup>3</sup>Thackeray, RPJT, p. 241.

<sup>4</sup>Lightfoot, NEP, p. 177. Also Resch, Ag., p. 27.

the evidence points toward the borrowing by the Testament of Jacob from 1 Cor. 2:9.<sup>1</sup> The Testament's list of the punishments of sinners was influenced by Rev. 21:8; the "fearful" character of judgment derives from Heb. 10:26-31; and the description of the blessings of the righteous is from 1 Cor. 2:9.<sup>2</sup> Paul was therefore not dependent on the Testament of Jacob.

Pseudo-Philo (LAB) has a most interesting coincidence of thought and words in XXVI 12. The general context<sup>3</sup> concerns precious stones, made by God to replace those of the pagan Amorite idolatries, which are placed in the house of God with the tables of the Law and later moved to the Temple. After the Temple was destroyed the stones were deposited, in the place from whence they came, to be reserved until the end time. This is "that place which eye hath not seen nor ear heard neither has it come up into the heart of man. . . ." <sup>4</sup> When the stones are once again brought into the world the sun and moon will

---

<sup>1</sup>Von Nordheim, ZNW 65:112-120, finds a common source behind the Testament and 1 Cor. 2:9. Hofius, ZNW 66:140-142, gives compelling evidence for the conclusion that the Testament borrowed from 1 Cor. 2:9. He also can demonstrate its borrowing from the NT writings, as diverse as Mt., 1 Cor., Ro., Heb., and Rev.

<sup>2</sup>Sparks, H. F. D., "1 Kor. 2:9 A Quotation From The Coptic Testament of Jacob?" Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 67 (1976), pp. 275-76.

<sup>3</sup>James, BAP, p. 157.

<sup>4</sup>This is quoted in the Latin in Thackeray, SPJT, p. 244. Thackeray dates LAB c. A.D. 70.

no longer be needed.<sup>1</sup> The phrase was therefore current in the first century Judaism in Palestine and may represent a Jewish anthology in oral and written form.<sup>2</sup>

With this brief survey in mind, there is a general consensus that the quotation has at least some affinities with Isa. 64:4. We conclude that Paul freely quoted from the conceptuality of the Isa. passage.

The Relation of Paul's Text-form to the LXX and MT. The LXX of Isa. 64:4 differs in several ways from the MT. A few pertinent changes are: the verb "to hear" is changed from third common plural to second plural; וְיִשְׁמְעוּ is omitted; eye is made a plural; ἡμῶν is an addition; καὶ τὰ ἔργα σου ἃ is an addition; ἦσθ' is changed to second person singular; ἔλεον is an addition. The LXX either expanded the Hebrew rather freely or worked from a text other than an MT type.<sup>3</sup>

With Paul the subject "we" of the LXX and "they" of MT has been changed to "things which," (ἃ). Ἄ first serves as an accusative of εἶδεν and ἤκουσεν then as nominative for ἀνεβη and thirdly in the accusative in

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Isa. 60:19-20.

<sup>2</sup>Thackeray, SPJT, p. 245. This rendering is also found in a Jewish collection cited by Ellis, (PUOT, p. 36, n. 12, continued from p. 35) which bears the title Mikropresbutikon, Basle 1950 [sic] (The date should read 1550). This aligns with the theory that the passage had a first century circulation.

<sup>3</sup>Harrison, IOT, p. 798.

apposition to ὅσα.<sup>1</sup> The order of "seeing" and "hearing" is reversed. ὁφθαλμος is anarthrous (and singular as in the three) as in the Hebrew. Paul's verbs of seeing and hearing are in third singular.

If Isa. 64:4 was used as the key text then καὶ ἐπὶ . . . ἀνέβη is an insertion. ἤτοίμασεν is in third singular as is the Hebrew. Ἀγαπῶσιν and αὐτόν are interpolations. If this is a representation of Isa. 64:4 it is certainly a free one. Of course "if Paul had a variant Greek text closer to his quotations, a textual solution is not improbable for 1 Cor. 2:9."<sup>2</sup> While not conclusive, Paul's reading of ὁφθαλμός οὐκ εἶδεν is very close to the three's reading of ὁφθαλμός οὐκ ἴδεν and may be evidence for an early Greek OT reading differing from the LXX.

A comparison of 1 Cor. 2:9 with Isa. 64:4 does show, however, a correspondence of several important terms in the first third of the quotation: ἀκούω, ὁφθαλμός and ὁράω. The aorist of ἀκούω comes last in the word order of the three in 1 Cor. 2:9. The tense of the two verbs remains the same with a change to the singular number in Corinthians.

---

<sup>1</sup>Robertson, 1 Cor., p. 40, finds this syntax "not at all violent."

<sup>2</sup>Ellis, PUOT, p. 36. Of course, such a statement almost goes without saying and could apply to most all of the quotations which vary from the LXX or MT.

There is no textual correspondence in the middle section (καὶ ἐπὶ . . . ἀνέβη) with Isa. 64:4. This phrase has strong similarities with Isa. 65:16 and Jer. 3:16 though the particle/verb and preposition/noun syntax is reversed in Corinthians.

The last part of 1 Cor. 2:9 shows the least affinity with Isa. 64:4 although the syntactical similarities should not be overlooked. Both passages commence with a relative pronoun and verb, followed by a dative of indirect object in the article, a verb of the same number, and a substantive in the accusative case. This syntactical similarity included in the same passage as the first part of the quote establishes a sufficiently plausible textual relationship when one is considering what appears to be a freely adapted quotation.

The problem, then, of locating Paul's Old Testament source stems not so much from lack of clear indication, which is evidence<sup>d</sup> by the common identification of the quotation as Isa. 64:4 with 65:16-17 or Jer. 3:16, but from a propensity to view the quotation in total as a near exact representation of another written source. With Paul's tendencies toward paraphrase and expansion, a forcing of the quote into such a rigid framework is unnecessary.

### Contextual

Wisdom. Paul, in continuing the discussion of

the superiority of God's wisdom over man's, considered the wisdom which was only spoken among the wise.<sup>1</sup> Paul gave the marks of God's foolishness in the world in chapter 1 and he commenced chapter 2 by showing how his ministry was conformed to the foolishness of the cross.<sup>2</sup> He has already called the foolishness of the cross σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ in 1:21; θεοῦ σοφίαν in 1:24; and σοφία ἡμῶν in 1:30 thus establishing the ground for what he says in 2:6. The key term μυστήριον had been applied in 2:1 to the message which Paul proclaimed to the Corinthians. It would seem, then, that when Paul mentioned a wisdom spoken ἐν τελείοις he has receptivity in mind rather than a spatial and secretively exclusive sense. This is borne out by his ψυχικὸς/πνευματικῶς exposition. This section<sup>3</sup> follows the description of Paul's preaching and was designed to show why his words could possibly be rejected or misunderstood. If Paul's way was the way approved by God, why wasn't it more in evidence and more universally accepted? Paul's answer evidences both an apologetic and a hortatory purpose and tactic.

There is an interesting comparison of conceptuality with Paul in Mt. 13:14-15 which mentions Isa. 6:9-10

---

<sup>1</sup>1 Cor. 2:6ff.

<sup>2</sup>Note the similar terms in 1 Cor. 2: ἀσθενεία, vs 3; σοφίας, vs 4; δυνάμει, vs 4; the whole of vs 5 is reminiscent of 1:17b.

<sup>3</sup>1 Cor. 2:6-16.



in reference to seeing, hearing and perceiving in the heart. The context concerns Israel's rebellious attitudes. Matthew displayed a similar division as Paul between those to whom the message of God was hidden and those to whom receptivity had been given. Both Isa. 6:9-10 (Mat.) and 64:4 (Paul) were used in polemical ways to explain why the Gospel was hidden from Israel yet known by the Christians.<sup>1</sup> This reinforces the understanding of the rulers as being humans.

The Rulers of the Age. Paul pointed out that the rulers of his age had no share in true wisdom because it was embodied in a mystery from which the rulers themselves were excluded. Knox and Schmithals view these rulers as angels rather than men and find this confirmed by 1 Cor. 15:24.<sup>2</sup> Allen<sup>3</sup> sees the rulers to be supernatural in view of the Psa. 23:7 LXX connection of rulers and glory. It seems, at best, that 1 Cor. 15:24 includes both human and angelic-demonic rule in its general statement of πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν. Death was one such enemy to be subjected and this is

---

<sup>1</sup>See also Mt. 11:25-27 and Lk. 10:23-24.

<sup>2</sup>Knox, SPCJ, pp. 112-13. Walter Schmithals, Gnosticism In Corinth, trans. John E. Steely (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971), p. 137.

<sup>3</sup>Leslie C. Allen, "The Old Testament Background Of (ΠΡΟ) 'ΟΡΙΖΕΙΝ In The New Testament," New Testament Studies 17 (1970-71), p. 107.



neither a terrestrial<sup>n</sup> or extra-terrestrial being according to Paul.<sup>1</sup> Bornkamm asserts, in a study of Ro. 13, that ἐξουσία has a purely political meaning in the singular and plural and is parallel to ἀρχοντες which equal earthly rulers. These words only describe demonic powers with explicit additions in the NT.<sup>2</sup> G. H. C. Macgregor takes the best of both and concludes that Paul included both the cosmic and human executives.<sup>3</sup> The connection with 1 Cor. 1:26 and 2:8 implies men. The concept of seeing and hearing are explicable only if related to humans.

Wesley Carr<sup>4</sup> notes that the rulers in Wisdom are human and that the καταργουμένων of 1 Cor. 2:6 refers to "decline into unimportance" not destruction.<sup>5</sup> In Baruch,

<sup>1</sup>See Eph. 3:10; 6:12; Col. 1:13; Dan. 10:13; 1 Pet. 1:12; Ro. 8:38; Col. 2:15; 1 Thess. 2:15.

<sup>2</sup>Gunther Bornkamm, Early Christian Experience, trans. Paul L. Hammer (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1969), p. 28, notes 36 and 39. He finds that ἐξουσία only refers to demons in explicitly Christological contexts and there with other references to demons. See Gene Miller, "APXONTΩN TOY AIΩNOS TOYTOY-A New Look At 1 Corinthians 2:6-8," Journal of Biblical Literature 91 (1972), pp. 522-28, for the same position.

<sup>3</sup>G. H. C. Macgregor, "Principalities And Powers: The Cosmic Background Of Paul's Thought," New Testament Studies 1 (1954-55), p. 23. See Col. 2:15 and Titus 3:1.

<sup>4</sup>Wesley Carr, "The Rulers Of This Age-1 Corinthians II.6-8," New Testament Studies 23 (1976), p. 31.

<sup>5</sup>Carr, NTS 23:33-35, endorses Thackeray's 9th Ab homily connection as best explaining the inclusion of the ἀρχοντες. See Bar. 3:9-4:4 for just such a homily.

as always in wisdom literature, the rulers are human. Thus Paul had men like Pilate, Herod, Caiaphas in mind.<sup>1</sup> The context also indicates human leaders whose<sup>2</sup> ignorance was that of the plan of God through the Cross. Thus the rulers' ignorance of this mystery was demonstrated by their treatment of Christ.<sup>3</sup> Verse 9 was designed to show that the rulers acted in accord,<sup>4</sup> *καθώς*, with what was written in an authoritative document and that this action was a direct contrast (*ἀλλά*) with the condition supposed by vs 8. After having supplied the condition of the rulers' actions towards Christ in vss 8-9, Paul then proceeded to illumine the medium through which the mystery was revealed: the Spirit. This both explains why the rulers did not know the wisdom of God and why it was possible for the believer. The basic elements of the context are: 1) the wisdom-mystery of God; 2) the ignorance of the rulers; 3) the spiritual medium for knowing God's wisdom. The quotation was designed to illustrate number two.

---

<sup>1</sup>Carr, NTS 23:21. Lk. 12:11 uses rulers in a human sense. For τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου see 1 Cor. 1:20 and 2 Cor. 4:4.

<sup>2</sup>See Acts 3:17, 13:27 for the ignorance of human leaders.

<sup>3</sup>1 Cor. 2:8.

<sup>4</sup>The fact that *καθώς* is part of the IF does not dilute its adverbial force of manner.

Paul could not escape from relating his argument to the crucifixion of Christ. He saw man's attitude to Christ to be dependent on his use of true wisdom, which was to be equated with the pure word of the cross. The elements of Paul's thoughts had been the cross, the worldly-wise, and true wisdom. In this section the apologetic function surfaces as Paul showed why the rulers rejected true wisdom and used them as a foil for those that had the wisdom revealed to them.<sup>1</sup> This contrast was central to Paul's developing argument.

The Isaiah Context. In Isa. 64:4 the prophet cried out to Yahweh in the midst of the turmoil surrounding the fall of Israel. While the precise date of this oracle is not obtainable its context clearly shows a desire on the part of the writer for God to manifest Himself as in days past<sup>2</sup> and his reason, as given in Isa. 64:4, was because of the great length of time which had elapsed since the people had seen God visibly in action. The idea was that an appearance of Yahweh would end the ignorant animosity of the adversaries and would cause the nations to tremble in acknowledgement of God's presence.<sup>3</sup>

Isa. 65:16 presents a context of punishment for Israel's enemies and blessedness for Israel in the new

---

<sup>1</sup>1 Cor. 2:10.

<sup>2</sup>Isa. 64:3.

<sup>3</sup>Isa. 64:2.

heaven and earth. Troubles will be forgotten and not come to mind, vs 16, and all the former things will be forgotten, vs 17.

Jeremiah 3:16 also looked ahead to the messianic reign but referred to the forgetting of the ark of the covenant because Jerusalem itself would become the throne of the Lord.<sup>1</sup>

The Isa. 64:4 passage is most appropriate to the Corinthian context. Paul had in mind the rebellious acts of the Jewish rulers while Isaiah speaks of the need for the nations to tremble at His presence. The components of ignorant rulers and the need for divine revelation apply to both contexts.

### Hermeneutical

IF Used Only for OT Writings. It is to be doubted that Paul ever uses an introductory formula to refer to non-canonical writings, unless this instance should be the exception.<sup>2</sup> J. A. Fitzmyer, on the other hand, says that "it is much more likely that the introductory

---

<sup>1</sup>Jer. 3:17.

<sup>2</sup>Henry Owen, The Modes Of Quotation Used By The Evangelical Writers Explained And Vindicated (London: J. Nichols, 1789), pp. 12f, has noted that IF are only used to point to biblical citations. Ellis, PUOT, pp. 35-37, notes that "the presence of an IF raises the inference of an immediate or ultimate OT source." Prigent, TZ 14:421-22. Lightfoot, NEP, p. 177. Johnson, QNT, p. 152. Bonsirven, EREP, p. 320. Questionable passages concerning IF: 1 Cor. 2:9; Eph. 4:8, 5:14; 1 Cor. 15:45b; 1 Tim. 5:18b.

formulae were at times used loosely also of other literature which served some didactic or ethical purpose."<sup>1</sup> Textual and contextual factors have shown that the OT is the source of this quotation and the IF is therefore an additional support for this conclusion. It remains to be seen what were the forces at work in the selection and alteration of the passage to fit the context of 1 Cor. 2.

One assumes that the quotation was inserted not to confuse but to enlighten and would therefore be identifiable to at least some of its readers. This being the case it is sufficient to see the general identity with a passage such as Isa. 64:4 until further textual discovery should convince one to look elsewhere. The general identification is clear enough considering the implications of the introductory formula and Paul's tendency to alter his texts.

Jewish Usages. Another tendency is the influence of the Rabbis. Since Paul is known to freely adapt his quotations,<sup>2</sup> an approach which sees this particular one to be more free than others seems reliable. The fragmentary nature of the quotation which may imply the unquoted section of the OT verse can be ascribed to Paul's rabbin-

---

<sup>1</sup>Fitzmyer, NTS 7:304.

<sup>2</sup>See Appendix II and III, Ellis, PUOT, pp. 155ff and 186ff.

ical (Judaistic) training.<sup>1</sup> Davies states that "the language that he [Paul] used in 1 Cor. 2.9 to describe the blessedness of the age to come was evidently traditional in Judaism."<sup>2</sup> In Sifre, Num. xxvii 12, sec. 135 and Targum this passage is given an eschatological interpretation.<sup>3</sup>

This quotation may have been part of an earlier tradition which was taken over by Paul.<sup>4</sup> The setting for the passage's development was the synagogue liturgy.<sup>5</sup> The first and last parts of the quotation are found separately or in reverse order in various Jewish and Christian literatures. Prigent's examples of the separate quotation of the first part are from later Christian writers such as Heg<sup>e</sup>l<sup>i</sup>ssip<sup>i</sup>lus, Martyrdom of Polycarp, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian and Theoph<sup>i</sup>ylus of Antioch. The minor variations in these quotations show

---

<sup>1</sup>Ellis, PUOT, pp. 45-46. However, Orr, 1 Cor., p. 157, queries that if Paul was manufacturing a quotation why not make one that fit his grammatical context better?

<sup>2</sup>Davies, PRJ, p. 307.

<sup>3</sup>Scroggs, NTS 14:47, n. 4, writes: "Thus Paul varies the text in the same direction as it was, apparently, customarily done by the Jews of his day. In both structure and content the passage can be seen without too much difficulty as a free midrash by Paul."

<sup>4</sup>Prigent, TZ 14:416.

<sup>5</sup>Feuillet agrees with Prigent, TZ 14:428, at this point, TD 14:145.

an independence from Paul as their source.<sup>1</sup> The examples Prigent gives of the b <sup>plus</sup> A a presentation of the passage are statedly dependent on Paul.<sup>2</sup> The Jewish evidence for a parentage with 1 Cor. 2:9 is drawn from a third century Midrash on Prov. 13:26 and Siphre, Num. 27:12. From this Prigent concludes that Paul was neither the compiler nor inventor of 1 Cor. 2:9.<sup>3</sup> However, Siphre and the Midrash do not take the thought or syntax much beyond the Hebrew, none adds the "upon the heart" phrase, and none have "love" for "await." While Paul may well be dependent upon a Jewish source, the evidence brought by Prigent does not make this conclusive. Also, Paul's use of the passage is primarily related to earthly, rather than the heavenly, blessings referred to in the Jewish literature. Grosheide views this as a possible hymn of Old Testament texts quoted by Paul but favors the opinion that Paul quoted the LXX of Isa. 64:4 "for the first and last part of the quotation and Isa. 65:17 for the middle."<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Prigent, TZ 14:417. Lightfoot, NEP, p. 177, however, sees them to be more like Paul than the LXX.

<sup>2</sup>Donald A. Hagner, The Use Of The Old And New Testaments In Clement Of Rome (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), p. 204, has shown regarding 1 Cor. 2:9 that Paul was dependent on the LXX and that Clement was dependent on Paul.

<sup>3</sup>Also Bauer, ZNW 50:108. See Ro. 8:28; 1 Cor. 8:3; Psa. 96:10; 144:20 for "those loving God."

<sup>4</sup>Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 66. Feuillet, RB 70:63, finds nonverbal affinities of sense between this passage,



Pauline Conflation of OT Texts. While the middle section of the quotation has strong affinities with Isa. 65:16 and 17, it is doubtful that Paul was quoting them. For Paul to have been consciously quoting Isa. 65:16 or 17 he then would have divided Isa. 64:4 in two parts and inserted the phrase in the middle. This would certainly not be unique in Paul's editing of quotations. Paul, in five quotations, Ro. 3:15-17, 9:27-8, 10:6-8, Eph. 6:2-3, and 1 Cor. 2:16 simply omits the central portions, quoting the first and last parts. Therefore the fact that he omits the central part of Isa. 64:4 is not unusual.

Less common in merged or chain quotations is the interpolation of one quotation into the middle of another in A-B-A form. This is only found in Ro. 9:33 and 11:8. In Ro. 9:33 a portion of Isa. 8:14 is placed into a quotation of Isa. 28:16. In Ro. 11:8, Isa. 29:10 is inserted after an arrangement of the  $\epsilon\delta\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$  and  $\delta\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$  from Deut. 29:4. Therefore it is part of Paul's procedure to merge one quotation into the middle of another.

---

Ecclesiastes 1:10 Ben Sirach and Job 28 and concludes that Paul is developing a theme from Old Testament sapiential literature. Job 28:27 uses  $\epsilon\tau\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  very similarly to 1 Cor. 2:9. Feuillet writes, p. 144, that "even if the text definitely depends on OT and Jewish sources, it still must be explained primarily by its immediate context." It would be difficult, however, to be able to clearly and consistently separate the sapiential from the apocalyptic in the NT. See Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 82, n. 75, for the overlapping of prophecy and wisdom in the OT. Conzelmann, 1 Kor., p. 82, opts for the apocalyptic label as does Wendland, Kor., p. 24.



Three factors, however, militate against the middle of 1 Cor. 2:9 being a quote from Isa. 65:16 or 17. First, the contexts from which the Old Testament passages of Ro. 9:33 and Ro. 11:8 are drawn are compatible with their use in Romans but the context of Isa. 65:16-17 is not relative to its use in Corinthians. It is a thesis of this paper that it is unlikely that Paul shows a total lack of regard for Old Testament context.

Secondly, if 1 Cor. 2:9 is a midrash-type presentation, a general reference to the Old Testament passage is all that is necessary and the rest of the quote may be merely Paul's elaboration. Jacob Lauterbach notes that often in the use of OT quotations in the Mekilta the interpretation is founded on the part of the passage which is not included in the commentary. The sign 'לל is given to signify "etc." He writes:

There are also instances in which the real proof is derived not from the cited passage itself but from the context of the scriptural passage which makes it evident that the sense of the cited passage is such as to furnish the proof required by the midrash.<sup>1</sup>

It is not necessary, therefore, that every part of the quotation passage have an exact Old Testament counterpart.

Thirdly, the phrase ἐπὶ καρδίαν . . . ἀνέβη

---

<sup>1</sup>Lauterbach, Mek. I, p. lx. A similar point is made by Dodd regarding the context-pointer qualities of NT quotations.

appears to be a simple idiom rather than a quotation.<sup>1</sup> Stephen, quoting Ex. 2:11-12 in Acts 7:23, uses ἀνέβη<sup>η</sup> ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν when referring to Moses' decision to visit his people Israel. The Greek phrase is not part of the language of Ex. 2, however. It was merely a part of Stephen's exposition. This phrase is a Semitic idiom for "come to mind" or "to think of." Ἀναβαίνω translates twenty-one Hebrew words.<sup>2</sup> It is found in conjunction with ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν in Isa. 65:16; Jer. 3:16; 28 (51):50; 39 (32):35; 51 (44):21; Ezek. 38:10 and means "to come to mind" in all cases. As this is a literal translation of the Hebrew, it is a Semitic idiom which had come over into the Greek. The synonymous nature of the idiom with the Hebrew זכר is clearly seen in the chiasmic synonymous parallelism of Jer. 51:50 (28:50 LXX).<sup>3</sup>

Since this is an idiom, it is probable that Paul, after noting the rulers' lack of perception by ear and eye, simply added in midrashic style the third possibility for gaining knowledge, the human imagination, rather than consciously conflating another OT passage.

---

<sup>1</sup>Lightfoot, NEP, p. 176, calls this a "Hebrew expression." See Acts 7:23; Jer. 3:16; 34:21; 51:50.

<sup>2</sup>H&R I, p. 70.

<sup>3</sup>זכר זכרי מרהוק את־יהוה וירושלם תעלה על־לבב<sup>2</sup> MT  
LXX μνήσθητε τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ἱερουσαλὴμ ἀναβήτω ἐπὶ καρδίαν  
ὁμῶν.

Summary. Paul's use of the passage coheres with the sense of the OT context. Clemen writes that "der Prophet meint die Gottesoffenbarung in der Erlösung aus dem Exil, Paulus die Erfüllung dieses Vorbildes in dem neutestamentlichen Heil."<sup>1</sup> Woods, on the other hand, finds it to be unfitting to the context in its awkward construction because Paul quoted it as a unit rather than composing it at hand.<sup>2</sup> Resch argues that because the quotation is so foreign to the context of Isaiah and cannot be found there, it must be from a lost work.<sup>3</sup> Lindars sees this section, 1 Cor. 2:6-16, to be shaped around the "widely used" Isa. 6:10.<sup>4</sup> Because he was not quoting for proof,<sup>5</sup> but rather for illustration, he was not so concerned with literal accuracy.<sup>6</sup> While one would not go so far as to say that the  $\kappa\alpha\theta\omega\varsigma$  makes the question of justice to the original meaning "irrelevant"<sup>7</sup> the

---

<sup>1</sup>Clemen, GAT, p. 191.

<sup>2</sup>Woods, HDB IV, p. 186.

<sup>3</sup>Resch, Ag., p. 125. See James Hardy Ropes, "Die Sprüche Jesu Die In Den Kanonischen Evangelien Nicht Überliefert Sind," Texte Und Untersuchungen 14, no. 2 (1896), pp. 19-22, for a refutation of Resch's view regarding 1 Cor. 2:9. No ET is available.

<sup>4</sup>Lindars, NTA, p. 246. <sup>5</sup>Johnson, QNT, p. 153.

<sup>6</sup>This is consistent with Richard T. Mead's, "A Dissenting Opinion About Respect For Context In Old Testament Quotations," New Testament Studies 10 (1963-64), pp. 279-89, conclusions regarding Gospel OT quotations.

<sup>7</sup>Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 66.

modal nature of the quotation is sufficiently true to the OT context to clearly link the blindness of those who crucified Christ with the ignorance bewailed by Isaiah.<sup>1</sup> This both illustrated why the rulers acted as they did and supports the concepts of revelation and wisdom being developed by Paul in the broader context. The use of θεός throughout 1 Cor. 2:7-10 shows a continuity of deity between the Testaments in Paul's mind.

The quotation was used, therefore, to show why the rulers were ignorant of God's intentions in Jesus as Messiah and why they crucified Him. It also has an aspect of exclusivism which was then developed in vs 10. The idea was that those who were loving God would know what He had prepared. The use of ἀγαπῶσιν rather than the LXX ὑπομένουσιν directly related to Paul's contrast of the attitude of those who crucified Christ with that of the Christians. Paul parted company with the Jewish and

---

<sup>1</sup>With regard to Rabbinic interpretations of Isa. 64:3, Johannes Bapt. Bauer, ". . . ΤΟΙΣ ΑΓΑΠΩΣΙΝ ΤΟΝ ΘΕΟΝ," Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 50 (195), p. 110, writes: "Jedenfalls wird aus dem altjudischen Verständnis der Jesajastelle klar, dass Paulus diese Interpretation ablehnen müsste. Also fasst er den Text ganz behutsam neu, indem er unmissverständlich den echten, tieferen Sinn unterlegt: nicht die selbstgerechten oder die Gesetzeskundigen, sondern die, die das wahre Gesetz der Liebe leitet, das sind diejenigen, auf die die Verheissung wirklich Zutrifft. Die Wendung, die er dafür sahlt, passt einerseits auch auf die alttestamentlichen Frommen, wie Abraham, anderseits nimmt sie dem zeitgenössischen Verständnis die Spitze, noch mehr, sie lässt die Verheissung nicht nur für das Juden-volk, sondern für alle göttingegebenen Menschen gelten."

later Christian traditions which used Isa. 64:4 as an example of heavenly blessings. Paul's quotation referred to the word of the Cross which offered both present and future benefits and highlighted the inability of men to know these things without divine enablement.

JEREMIAH 9:24 (9:23 LXX), 1 CORINTHIANS 1:31Textual Display

<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>NT</u>
(9:23)		ἵνα
		καθώς
		γέγραπται
-כִּי אֵם	ἀλλ'	
	ἢ	
בְּאֵן	ἐν	
	τούτῳ	
יִהְיֶה	καυχάσθω	
	ὁ	ὁ
הַמְהִלֵּה	καυχώμενος	καυχώμενος
הַשָּׂכֵל	συνίειν	
	καί	
אֵין וְיָדַע	γινώσκειν	
כִּי	ὅτι	
אֵין	ἐγώ	
	εἰμί	ἐν
יְהוָה	κύριος	κυρίῳ
		καυχάσθω

Masoretic Variants

BHS offers no variants for this section.

Septuagintal Variants

The GLXX notes that Clement in his epistle to the

Corinthians reads ο καυχωμενος εν κυριω καυχασθω for Jer. 9:24. This appears to be a conformity to the reading of 1 Cor. 1:31 unless a textual solution be supposed.<sup>1</sup> Swete notes that Q omits η; K in the first corrector reads με after γινωσκειν.

### New Testament Variants

Tischendorf lists no variants for this passage. Nestle notes that P<sup>46</sup> and Tertullian read θεω in place of κυριω which is possibly an attempt to translate and identify the Hebrew יהוה.<sup>2</sup>

### Textual

Paul inverted the order of the participle and hortative of the LXX and replaced τούτῳ with κύριος which occurs later in the LXX passage. Ἐν κυρίῳ appears between the verb and the verbal. This "near-quotation"<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Lightfoot, NEP, p. 169, cf., also Hagner, OTCR, p. 204.

<sup>2</sup>Recently George Howard, "The Tetragram And The New Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature 96 (1977), pp. 63-83, has put forth a theory that the NT autographa contained either the Hebrew or an Aramaic or Greek transliteration of the divine name and that in the late first and early second centuries these were altered to read κ̅ς̅ or Ὡς̅. Howard asserts that such changes were not consistent thereby creating the uncertainty as to whether the Father or Son is in view in any given instance. In light of this radical thesis the question of who inserted κυρίῳ, Paul or a later editor, may have to remain an open one. Howard avoids dogma and admits his thesis needs much further study and verification.

<sup>3</sup>Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 36. Eduard Böhl, Die Alttestamentlichen Zitate Im Neuen Testament (Wien:

is at variance with the LXX and the MT, both of which agree. One exception to this agreement might be in the idiomatic LXX translation of  $\text{-}\Pi\aleph \text{ } \text{'}\text{J}$  by  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ , however, both terms express a similar adversative concept.

### Contextual

This quotation is taken from the message delivered by Jeremiah in the temple gate.<sup>1</sup> He criticized Judah's cultic worship in chapter 7 and in chapters 8-10 he spoke of the future destruction of the southern kingdom. A call is given in Jer. 9:12 for the wise man to give a reason why the land perishes, but the answer is given instead by the Lord. The people had forsaken His law and were walking in their own ways. Verses 23-24 are a summation of the call to the people which focused them on the heart of the matter: not their own might but the character of the Lord and His deeds were His delight.

In Jer. 9:23  $\delta \sigma\acute{o}\phi\omicron\varsigma$  is a subject repeated from 9:12 and relates to the concept at hand in 1 Cor. 1. This quotation forms the climax of a complex and detailed elaboration of the reason why God had chosen to act in the foolishness of the Cross. The first thing to come to Paul's mind when confronted with the problem of factions

---

Wilhelm Braumüller, 1878), p. 211, makes the questionable assertion that the *Volksbibel* gave Paul the authority to use this as a "herrlichen Zitat." Cerfaux, RHE 27:528, concludes that the Jeremiah passage, when compared with 1 Reigns 2:10LXX and 1 Clement 31:1, is the primitive reading.

<sup>1</sup>Jer. 7:1f.



was the centrality and implications of the cross of Christ.<sup>1</sup> The word of wisdom made void the cross.<sup>2</sup> The word of the cross was really the power of God<sup>3</sup> and made ineffectual the opinions of Jew and Greek. As an example of this the believers were shown to be of low stature and origin in society.<sup>4</sup> God's reason was to make ineffectual the items and concepts held high by unbelieving men. This is cataloged in vss 27-28. The purpose of this was to level all men before God.<sup>5</sup> The quotation gave the proper authority to this assertion and brought the reader back to the centrality of Christ. For the wise man in the last days of Judah and in first century Corinth the object of boasting remained the same. Διχαλοσύνη also occurs in 1 Cor. 1:30 and in Jer. 9:24. Both occurrences refer to the acts of God on earth, the latter in general morality, the former in the act of Christ.

### Hermeneutical

The Old Testament quotation has the command to boast followed by the content of the boast. The New Testament precedes the command to boast with the specific

---

<sup>1</sup>1 Cor. 1:13.

<sup>2</sup>1 Cor. 1:17.

<sup>3</sup>1 Cor. 1:18-19.

<sup>4</sup>1 Cor. 1:26ff.

<sup>5</sup>1 Cor. 1:29.

of the boast.<sup>1</sup> The participial phrase of Jer. 9:24<sup>2</sup> of the LXX, ὁ ποιῶν κ.τ.λ., delineates the basic content of knowing and understanding the meaning of the phrase "I am Lord." Paul, in 1 Cor. 1:30, delineated "the Lord" by an adjectival relative clause, ὃς ἐγενήθη κ.τ.λ.. In both contexts the boasting was to center on the things of God. In Paul's case the Lord was to be equated with Christ. This brought a soteriological conception to bear in that self-righteousness was repugnant to God whether in Jews or Gentiles.<sup>3</sup> In Corinthians, a principle of boasting was taken from one context and applied to a similar problem.

Paul had several concepts in mind which had a determinative hermeneutical effect on this chapter. He concluded that pride was at the heart of the factions; that this pride was being cloaked in the guise of wisdom; and that the cross had lost its central hold on their thoughts and actions. Thus the quotations are grouped around wisdom and boasting. It is interesting to note that these are not mere word associations but relate to a consistent and pre-conceived historical framework of

---

<sup>1</sup>1 Cor. 1:30.

<sup>2</sup>Not included under the Textual Display section.

<sup>3</sup>Wendland, 1 Kor., p. 21. Clemen, GAT, p. 189, calls ἐν κυρίῳ "die Principalursache alles Heils. . . ."

thought. The OT context is quite appropriate, especially with regard to the pairs of words in Jer. 9:23LXX.<sup>1</sup>

While the historical setting<sup>5</sup> of the OT and NT contexts differ in their specifics, the problem is quite similar. The solution is a principle, drawn "par une simplification réductrice, de Jérémie" and is a "déduction simple, par conversion négative, dirait-on en logique mineure."<sup>2</sup> This method of moving from the concrete situation of Jeremiah to a universal and abstract in 1 Corinthians is a legitimate and oft seen Pauline method.<sup>3</sup>

This portion of 1 Corinthians displays affinities with the Baruch Homily on wisdom.<sup>4</sup> C. K. Barrett<sup>5</sup> thinks the relation to Baruch is possible while F. F. Bruce thinks it "quite doubtful."<sup>6</sup> If Paul used such a homily it would probably have been taken from the Haphtorah for the day of Ab 9 and would have had Jer.

---

<sup>1</sup>Orr, 1 Cor., p. 156. Jer. 9:23 LXX: Μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐν τῇ ἰσχύϊ αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ.

<sup>2</sup>Bonsirven, EREP, p. 298.

<sup>3</sup>Bonsirven, EREP, p. 327.

<sup>4</sup>Thackeray, SJW, p. 96f. Wilhelm Wuellner, "Haggadic Homily Genre in 1 Corinthians 1-3," Journal of Biblical Literature 89 (1970), pp. 199-204, finds a homily Gattung in these chapters.

<sup>5</sup>Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 51.

<sup>6</sup>Bruce, 1&2 Cor., p. 37.

9:22ff as his sermon text.<sup>1</sup> Note the correspondence of σοφοί, δύνάτοι, εὐγενεῖς of 1 Cor. 1:26 and 1:27 for τὰ ἰσχυρά. Note also the use of ἔλεος, κρίμα and δικαιοσύνην in Jer. 9:24 LXX and σοφία, δικαιοσύνη, ἁγιασμός απολυτρώσις in 1 Cor. 1:30.

What we observe in this use of the Old Testament is the extraction of a principle; to all appearances a valid one. When one speaks of drawing a principle, the question of validity always remains open. A principle is here considered valid in terms of Pauline thought only. Validity occurs when a consistency from the OT to the NT is adduced on the basis of the identification of the God of the OT with the God of the NT as expressed in His work in Jesus as the Messiah. Of course, for Paul, Yahweh of the OT was his God and what He said in the OT was valid for Paul's day, even apart from Jesus as Messiah. Therefore continuity of deity is essential and Jesus as Messiah provides a focus for OT thought. This principle was then applied by Paul to the Corinthian situation by a climactic reference to the specific Old Testament source. His aim was neither to reproduce the Old Testament context nor its specific words, but rather to adapt the sense of

---

<sup>1</sup>Barrett, 1 Cor., p. 61. The Haftarah (Hebrew haphtarah, "conclusion") is the lesson in the Prophets read after the reading in the Law. Such lessons may be dated as early as 168 B.C.; J. H. Hertz, ed., The Pentateuch And Haftorahs (London: Humphrey Milford, 1928), p. 434.

the passage in at least two ways. First, he provided enough words and syntax to point the way clearly to the Old Testament reference. Second, he translated the meaning into the Corinthian situation. This becomes more apparent upon examining the introductory formula.

<sup>e</sup>Iνα should be taken as a particle of result, indicating that the logical outcome of what Christ became, 1 Cor. 1:30, was to end in men's boasting. The IF may either be an anacoluthon or an ellipsis with γένε<sup>η</sup>ται understood.<sup>1</sup> Possibly Paul has taken up the LXX κύριος and identified Him with the Christ.<sup>2</sup> However, it is also possible that κύριος refers to ὁ θεός. P<sup>46</sup> reads θεός for κύριος and Paul's context shows that God the Father is the active agent. The use of ἵνα throughout this passage<sup>3</sup> indicates the purpose and result of the actions of the Father. It could follow, therefore, that the ἵνα of vs 31 stands in reference to God as well because ἵνα is to be related to the ἐγενήθη of vs 30 which, while having Christ as the passive subject, views God as the active agent, ἀπὸ θεοῦ. Also vs 29, which serves as a paraphrastic statement of the quotation, has

---

<sup>1</sup>Lightfoot, NEP, p. 168. For ellipsis after ἵνα see Ro. 4:16, Gal. 2:9, 2 Cor. 7:13. Friedrich Wilhelm Maier, "Ps 110,1 (LXX 109,1) Im Zusammenhang Von 1 Kor 15, 24-26," Biblische Zeitschrift 20 (1932), p. 139, discusses γὰρ as an IF.

<sup>2</sup>Grosheide, 1 Cor., p. 54.

<sup>3</sup>vss 27-28.

θεός as the subject. Thus the sense of the quote would normally follow this line of thought also.<sup>1</sup> It appears that Paul used the word κύριος from the end of the LXX passage as a summary of what he omitted.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, it is nearly certain that Paul's κύριος is the same as his θεός throughout 1 Cor. 1.

The Hebrew boast was in the knowing of Yahweh and the ἐν τούτῳ of the LXX follows this sense. For Paul to replace τούτῳ with κύριος is a significant alteration and makes Turpie's remark all the more telling: only after one has seen the character of God displayed in His acts can one truly "glory in the Lord."<sup>3</sup> If κύριος be equated with Christ, Paul added his mystical sense of union with Christ to the intellectual aspect of boasting. This takes the force of the quotation a step further than the original. It would demonstrate how the principle, valid in the Old Testament, is not only valid for New Testament morality but is also wholly compatible with Paul's soteriology. This is a clear use of the OT for Christian morality. The equation of κύριος with Yahweh of the OT shows continuity of deity between the Testaments as well as piety. This call to worship is not a "Golden Word"

---

<sup>1</sup>However, the ἐν of the quote may take on a new meaning in association with the ἐν χριστῷ of vs 30.

<sup>2</sup>i.e. συνίεν καὶ γινώσκεν ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμί. . . .

<sup>3</sup>Turpie, OTN, p. 68.

for illustrative effect but is tied into the very sub-  
structure of Paul's theology and piety.

JEREMIAH 9:24, 2 CORINTHIANS 10:17Textual Display\*Masoretic Variants\*Septuagintal Variants\*New Testament Variants

Tischendorf notes that L (qui talia saepe habet) 47\* al read καυχόμενος.

Textual\*Contextual<sup>1</sup>

Paul in chapter 10 once again defended himself and his apostleship. The immediate context concerns Paul's assertion that he was within his own allotted sphere of missions when he ministered to the Corinthians and that he had not trespassed into the work of another. He would not boast in another man's work.<sup>2</sup>

Hermeneutical

It is very probable that Paul's use of καυχόμαι<sup>3</sup>

---

\*See on previous section, pp. 341-43.

<sup>1</sup>For the OT context see on previous section,

<sup>2</sup>2 Cor. 10:16.

<sup>3</sup>Rudolf Bultmann, "καυχόμαι," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament III (Grand Rapids: Wm. B.



in 2 Cor. 10:15, 16 led his thoughts to the proverb-type remark of vs 17. Paul, in vs 18, clarified his interesting line of thought. The glorying in the Lord mentioned in vs 17 was not, in this case, centered on what the Lord was or had done soteriologically, but rather meant glorying in the content of the Lord's<sup>1</sup> commendation. This appears not to be an eschatological concept so much as a tangible reality: men's labors.<sup>2</sup> Paul equated a successful ministry with the commendation of the Lord. Paul's use of the OT has moved far from the Jeremiah context, most likely as a result of the proverbial form the quotation had assumed through the years, but his identification of κύριος with the God of the OT shows a continuity of deity.

---

Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965), pp. 645-49, notes that the concept "to boast" can be synonymous with "to trust" in Jewish thought, e.g. Psa. 97:7 and Jer. 42:17. With reference to Jer. 9:22ff he notes that this refers both in the Jer. and 2 Cor. contexts to "the true boasting which consists in self-humbling before God. . . .," p. 645. This element of trust is primary to Paul, Philo (e.g. Sepc. Leg. I 311) and the OT.

<sup>1</sup>κύριος in this case may mean God Himself but, as Plummer, 2 Cor., p. 290, writes "it is remarkable with what readiness N.T. writers transfer what in O.T. is said of Jehovah to Jesus Christ, and this may be a case in point."

<sup>2</sup>vs 15a.

## TEXTUAL DISTINCTIONS IN 1 AND 2 CORINTHIANS

### 1 CORINTHIANS

It remains to be seen if the OT passages quoted in 1 and 2 Corinthians open the possibility of discerning a particular text-type used by Paul. That agreements with one or another LXX witness may be Christian modifications of the LXX, especially when the evidence is sparse and late, has already been considered.

#### Summary Of Textual Evidence

A summary of the evidence previously given will give a broad picture regarding the OT text used by Paul to function as a basis for the textual conclusions of Part Three. Generally, the OT passages represented in Paul's quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. have no severe critical problems surrounding their textual history. The implications of this will be seen below. The critical LXX editions list few or no variants for Psa. 94:1 (1 Cor. 3:20). Dt. 25:4 (1 Cor. 9:9), shows only a corrected itacism and a variant reading of Justin. Dt. 32:1 (1 Cor. 10:20), shows two minor variants. Psa. 24:1 (1 Cor. 10:26) has minor variants. Psa. 110:1 (1 Cor. 15:27), notes that the Sahidic and Paul of Tella have minor

variants. Isa. 22:13 (1 Cor. 15:32) shows only minor variants. With such uniform MSS witness it is almost assured that any variants in these quotations have arisen from Paul's own hand.

Other quotation passages have a more complex set of variants. In 1 Cor. 1:19, the LXX variants basically concern the addition of either αὐτῶν and συνετῶν by the bulk of the Lucianic groups for the former and by Eusebius, V and a minor Lucianic witness, 93, for the latter. Eusebius, with 564<sup>txt</sup> and 301, also reads ἀθετήσω for κρύψω. If Eusebius was following Paul at this point, he nevertheless deviates from him regarding the above-mentioned uses of αὐτῶν. The major LXX witnesses κ B A and others, are mirrored in Paul's quotation except for his use of ἀθετήσω.

In 1 Cor. 1:31 the LXX has no major variants and only minor ones in Q and κ, with Clement offering the only witness to Paul's form. Once again the LXX text is well attested but Paul has loosely paraphrased, most assuredly on his own. In 1 Cor. 2:9 Paul's quotation is textually related to Isa. 64:4 only in the loosest fashion. The most significant LXX variant is the reading of ἀληθίνα καί by the Lucianic groups.

The LXX of Isa. 40:13, used in 1 Cor. 2:16, has variants which involve the transposition of συμβούλος αὐτοῦ and omission of αὐτοῦ; a φ for ὅς; a dialectic preference of συμβίβασει to συμβίβα; an αὐτῷ for αὐτόν.

Paul left out the middle of the quotation and quoted the first and last parts verbatim. Major witnesses from the Alexandrian, Hexaplaric, Lucianic and Catena groups read συμβίβασει with Paul. B is a notable exception.

The single variant of Job 5:13 (1 Cor. 3:19) is the addition of αὐτῶν to φρονήσει by A which Paul displays as well. Paul has also changed the words of the main verb and the object of the preposition.

While one cannot be too rigid in claiming that Paul used Dt. 22:24 for his source in 1 Cor. 5:13, it seems that Paul only changed the mood and number of the main verb. The predominant LXX variants, none of which agree with Paul, also center on the verb.

Paul agrees with the main LXX witnesses in 1 Cor. 6:16, in his inclusion of οἱ δύο. Only a few LXX MSS omit the phrase.

For the quotation of Nu. 14:16 (1 Cor. 10:5) the few variants, none of which are read by Paul, concern the verb. Paul's only deviation concerns the voice and person of the verb. Due to Paul's quite free paraphrase of Isa. 28:11-12 in 1 Cor. 14:21, the LXX variants, as they exist, do not prove helpful in pointing towards a hermeneutical pattern in the apostle.

Only minor variants surround the quotation of Isa. 45:14 (1 Cor. 14:25) but Paul provides a form either closer to the Hebrew or an accurate paraphrase of the Greek OT.

Gen. 2:7 (1 Cor. 15:45) finds only minor variants in the LXX and is accurately reproduced in syntax and words by Paul. He has, however, inserted an adjective before and a proper name after ἄνθρωπος.

The merged quotation of Isa. 25:8 and Hos. 13:14 (1 Cor. 15:54-55) shows three word substitutions by 613 and 93, and Syh Q for the Isaiah passage and there are several variants in the Hosea portion. Paul agrees with the Θ' reading in Isaiah but not in Hosea. He agrees with the main LXX witnesses with the exception of word order and the substitution of νῆκος and θάνατε. He does not use the Lucianic rendering νίκη.<sup>1</sup>

Among the variations listed above several call for a close comparison. A textual phenomenon of special interest with regard to the OT text-type of Paul's quotations is the change from κρύψω to ἀθετήσω in 1 Cor. 1:19. The OT evidences for ἀθετήσω are 564<sup>txt</sup>, 301 and Eusebius' commentary on Isa. 29:14. 564 is a tenth century catena witness; 301 a ninth century witness for the Alexandrian type; and the GLXX assigns Eusebius to the Hexaplaric group. This change<sup>however, may well</sup> be a later Christian harmonization to the NT. Paul's OT quotation of 1 Cor. 2:16 also agrees with 564 regarding the reading of συμβίβασει. This orthographical preference is shared

---

<sup>1</sup>1 Cor. 1:19; 14:25; 15:54-55 clearly show a greater or lesser divergence from the Lucianic group.

by many MSS,  $\kappa^a$  A V and  $Q^{mg}$  among others.

As a convincing indication that 564 and 301 display a text-type used by Paul, one would expect to find a more consistent agreement between 564 and 301 throughout Paul's OT quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. This is not the case, however. In the 1 Cor. 2:16 quotation, 564 stands alone in reading  $\tilde{\phi}$  for  $\delta\varsigma$  and is also unique in reading  $\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\tau\omega$   $\tau\tilde{\phi}$   $\lambda\alpha\tilde{\phi}$  rather than  $\tau\tilde{\phi}$   $\lambda\alpha\tilde{\phi}$   $\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\tau\omega$ , which is not followed by Paul in 1 Cor. 14:21. A further disagreement of 564 with Paul's quotation is the omission of the article before  $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$  in Isa. 45:14 which Paul includes in 1 Cor. 14:26. Also in 1 Cor. 2:16, 564 disagrees with Paul in reading  $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\tilde{\phi}$  for  $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\acute{o}\nu$ . Of course this applies both ways: if 564 is not generally prone to alter its OT quotation in accordance with Paul, a textual solution better accounts for the single conformity with 1 Cor. 1:19.

Clement, in his Epistle to the Romans, used the same quotation form as Paul in 1 Cor. 1:31, when quoting Jer. 9:24<sub>h</sub>. <sup>(cf. LXX variants)</sup> Clement appears to have harmonized his OT quotation to the NT form rather than to have used an independent LXX text-type.

In 1 Cor. 2:9, there are two important textual similarities. Clement of Rome, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, 34:8, gives a reading nearly identical to that of Paul. If he was influenced by the NT quotation, he also had the LXX in mind judging by his use of  $\upsilon\pi\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ .

Also in LAB 26:12 is another close approximation to Paul's quotation.

While no known MSS of the LXX read σοφῶν for ἀνθρώπων in Psa. 94:11, several NT MSS read ἀνθρώπων for σοφῶν in Paul's quotation in 1 Cor. 3:20. One assumes that the minuscule MSS 3, 33, 614 and others reflect a tradition which sought to bring Paul's quotation into conformity with the LXX text on hand.

With regard to 1 Cor. 9:9 and Paul's quotation of Dt. 25:4, one can be fairly certain that Paul did not find κήμωσεις in his Greek Bible. Philo reads κήμωσεις also but this may be a later Christian interpolation in Philo rather than evidence for a text-type used by Philo and Paul.

In 1 Cor. 15:45 σ' and θ' include ἀνθρώπος though in a position transposed from that of Paul. While this does supply an added verbal coincidence with the Pauline quotation there is no indication that σ' and θ' point to a type used by the apostle.

1 Cor. 15:54 was shown to have a marked agreement with θ' and a lesser agreement with σ'. The use of νίκη, Hosea 13:14, by 22<sup>C</sup>, 130, 311, 534 and others points to a text-type used by Paul. 22 is dated in the 11th to 12th centuries. 130-311 form a catena sub-group dating in the 12th century for 311 and the 12th to 13th for 130. 534 is an independent catena witness from the 11th century. The GLXX indicates that νίκη is a late correction of 22

which originally read διαθήκη. Διαθήκη is the reading of the primary Lucian witnesses with the exception of 36. The correction of 22 away from the Lucianic reading could either have been corrected using the NT MS of 1 Cor. or, more probably, an OT MS of Hosea.

### Textual Similarities

A chart of the variants in 1 Cor. is as follows.<sup>1</sup>

1 Cor. 1:19	ἀθετήσω for κρύψω
1 Cor. 1:31	free paraphrase
1 Cor. 2: 9	free paraphrase
1 Cor. 2:16	shortened quotation
1 Cor. 3:19	alternate translation
1 Cor. 3:20	σοφῶν for ἀνθρώπων
1 Cor. 5:13	ἐξάρατε for ἐξαρεῖς
1 Cor. 6:16	identical
1 Cor. 9: 9	κημῶσεις for φιμώσεις
1 Cor. 10: 5	κατεστρώθησαν for κατέστρωσεν αὐτούς
1 Cor. 10: 7	identical (itacism of πλεῖν)
1 Cor. 10:20	θύουσιν for ἔθυσαν
1 Cor. 10:26	identical

---

<sup>1</sup>The OT quotations are described either as identical; close paraphrase (where the verbal and syntactical similarities show a close following of the Greek OT); alternate translation (where the verbal and syntactical relations differ radically from the Greek OT but the sense is nearly identical); free paraphrase; shortened quotation (where one section is missing from an otherwise verbatim quotation). Where the difference is only the substitution or addition of a word or two, the words in question are given



1 Cor. 14:21	free paraphrase
1 Cor. 14:25	alternate translation
1 Cor. 15:25	close paraphrase
1 Cor. 15:27	alternate translation
1 Cor. 15:32	identical
1 Cor. 15:45	ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἄδᾰμ for ὁ ἄνθρωπος
1 Cor. 15:54-55	alternate translation (Θ') and close paraphrase

The special points of agreement in 1 Cor. with the Greek OT witnesses are as follows:

1 Cor. 1:19	564 <sup>txt</sup> 301 Eus.
1 Cor. 1:31	Clement
1 Cor. 2: 9	Clement to Cor. 34:8, LAB 26:12
1 Cor. 2:16	564 and many others
1 Cor. 9: 9	Philo
1 Cor. 15:45	Philo
1 Cor. 15:54-55	Θ' and to a lesser degree Q and Syh. Possibly νίκη (Paul νίκος) of the Lucian group.

Looking back over the first chart one finds that there are four identical quotations, six single word substitutions, four alternate translations, two close paraphrases, three free paraphrases, one two-word addition, and one shortened quotation. Out of the twenty-one OT passages quoted, then, nine quotations are quite different from the mainstream of the LXX tradition while twelve follow it rather closely.

In the second chart, one sees that the witnesses for the peculiar readings of Paul's OT quotations are, in the main, late and open to the possibility of conformation to the NT. There also lacks any substantial group of witnesses which appears consistently throughout the quotations. Those readings supported by Philo, LAB and Theodotion are given special consideration in the next section.

## 2 CORINTHIANS

### Summary Of Textual Evidence

It is a previously accepted conclusion that Paul's quotations from the OT agree in the main with the LXX tradition as opposed to being ad hoc translations from the Hebrew or adaptations of Aramaic Targums. This section will, like that for 1 Cor. attempt to discern any special agreement of Paul's quotations with particular strands of the Greek OT.

In the 2 Cor. 3:16 (Ex. 34:34) quotation, the presence of ἐπιστρέψῃ for the LXX εἰσεπορεύετο finds no LXX textual support. However, Targum Pseudo Jonathan on Ex. 33:7 has a very close affinity of sense. Further research may confirm an early date for the targumic pericope in question thereby increasing the possibility that it was known to Paul.

In 2 Cor. 4:13 the absence<sup>c</sup> of the disputed καί, which is not included by Nestle or the UBS texts, would leave a verbatim quotation.

In 2 Cor. 6:16-18 Paul shows an affinity with the Lucianic group<sup>1</sup> by reading αὐτῶν in the Isa. 52:11 quotation rather than αὐτῆς. The καί before ἀφορίσθητε in Isa. 52:11 is supported by Q, 88, Syh, 22<sup>C</sup> and others and is also read by Paul.

For the Leviticus and 2 Samuel quotations of 2 Cor. 6:16-18 textual trends are apparent and a short digression will show how firmly and accurately the underlying LXX text was present either in Paul's mind or before his eyes.

Due to the complex textual relationships of the OT passages to Paul's use of them a scaled-down comparison will show how methodically the OT texts were adapted. The Ezek. 37:27 passage is also included due to the similarities it bears to 2 Cor. 6:16. Just the portions of 2 Cor. 6:16-18 which directly compare with the OT are given here.

<u>LXX</u>		<u>LXX</u>
<u>Lev. 26:12</u>	<u>2 Cor. 6:16b</u>	<u>Ezek. 37:27</u>
καί	καί	καί
ἔσομαι	ἔσομαι	ἔσομαι
ὕμῶν	αὐτῶν	αὐτοῖς
θεός	θεός	θεός
καί	καί	καί

---

<sup>1</sup>GLXX: 22-48-51-231-763+90-130-311+36-93-96-86<sup>C</sup>  
534 Cypr.

LXXLev. 26:12

ὕμεῖς

ἐσεσθέ

μου

λαός

2 Cor. 6:16b

αὐτοί

ἔσονται

μου

λαός

LXXEzek. 37:27

αὐτοί

ἔσονται

μοι

λαός

Paul's use of αὐτῶν is obviously dependent on the plural αὐτοῖς in the first part of Paul's quotation.<sup>1</sup> The ὑμῶν of Lev. 26:12 has been adjusted by Paul to fit the ἐν αὐτοῖς of his previous line. The same would hold for Paul's καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται; the αὐτοί reflecting the 3rd pl. pronoun motif which begins the quotation; the ἔσονται likewise with regard to the 3rd pl. ending. Paul's ἐνοικήσω may have arisen from the κατασκήνωσις of Ezekiel. In this case, then, the passage aligns with Ezekiel and Paul's ἐμπεριπατήσω would be only a rather oblique allusion to Lev. 26:12. The context of Ezek. 37:27 fits the temple and purity image of 2 Cor. 6:16. The Ezek. context is the eschatological temple whereas the Lev. is past historical. The Lev. passage might be preferred due to it being in the Law, but the commonly seen threefold Law, Prophets and Writings configuration does not apply because the third quotation is from a

---

<sup>1</sup>ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς.

prophetic book, 2 Sam. While the 3rd pl. idea may be attributed to the Ezek. passage the genetival use is clearly from Lev.<sup>1</sup>

LXX

Isa. 52:11b

ἐξέλθατε

ἐκ

μέσου

αὐτῆς

(καί)

αφορίσθητε

2 Cor. 6:17

ἐξέλθατε

ἐκ

μέσου

αὐτῶν

καί

ἀφορίσθητε

As has been noted, the Lucianic group supports αὐτῶν for αὐτῆς in Isa. 52:11b and Q 88-Syh 22-93-456 564 393 544 Eus. comm et ecl include the καί. Therefore this passage has not been adapted internally to fit its new context but follows an early text-type.

LXX

2 Sam. 7:14

ἔσομαι

αὐτῷ

εἰς

πατέρα

καί

αὐτός

2 Cor. 6:18

ἔσομαι

ὑμῖν\*

εἰς

πατέρα

καί

ὑμεῖς\*

---

<sup>1</sup>ὁμῶν and μου as contrasted with the αὐτοῖς and μου of Exekiel.

LXX2 Sam. 7:14

ἔσται

μοι

εἰς

υἱόν

2 Cor. 6:18

ἔσεσθε\*

μοι

εἰς

υιούς\*

In the case of 2 Cor. 6:18 we can clearly see a systematic alteration of 2 Sam. 7:14. The case remains the same but the words are changed, in the first three (\*) instances, to the second person plural and the fourth word (\*) becomes a plural. The shift from third to second plural is occasioned by the εἰσδέξομαι ὑμᾶς of 2 Cor. 6:17. Here the case of ὑμῶν seems to be dependent upon the LXX μοι and follows the case of the αὐτῷ which it replaces. While the word is changed, the case schema of the original is maintained.

We have in these examples, therefore, clear evidence of a knowing and systematic adaptation of the text of the LXX to a Christian usage. The variations are not memory slips but are often textually accountable. This quotation has the marks of a thought-out and carefully-constructed theological position. All three OT passages are the direct utterances of Yahweh thus the fitting and specific IF, καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι. The theological framework is nowhere clearer than in the 2 Sam. 7:14 quotation where the LXX third singular was in

reference to Solomon but in 2 Cor. 6:18 it has been changed to apply to the readers themselves. This is confirmed by 2 Cor. 7:1 where this is identified as one of the promises which the readers were presently having.

The quotation of Ex. 16:18 in 2 Cor. 8:15 was seen to have an affinity with n, Arm and Boh in placing οὐκ ἐπλεόνασεν after πολὺ and with A<sup>a</sup> Philo and σ' by reading ὀλίγον for ἔλαττον. The wider geographical spread represented by n, Arm and Boh is surprising enough to be noteworthy.

While the quotation of Psa. 112:9 in 2 Cor. 9:9 displays no textual distinctions it is proper to note that there is a conformation of the NT version back to the LXX in F G K 6 39 42 f g vg<sup>cle</sup> Aeth by the addition of τοῦ αἰῶνος.

Paul's use of σταθήσεται for στήσεται in his quotation of Dt. 19:15 in 2 Cor. 13:1 is also reflected in A F M N and others. The omission of the second ἐπὶ στόματος is also in b d f m n w Arm. and others. The absence of the second μαρτύρων is also in b f m w. These witnesses are important due to their geographical divergence, Africa and Europe, and their underlying text-types, e.g. Alexandrian for the Bohairic and Caesarean/Koine(?)<sup>1</sup> for the Armenian.

---

<sup>1</sup>Bruce M. Metzger, The Text Of The New Testament (Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1968), p. 83.

Textual Similarities

A chart of the variants in 2 Cor. is as follows:

2 Cor. 3:16	free paraphrase
2 Cor. 4:13	identical
2 Cor. 6: 2	identical
2 Cor. 6:16	free paraphrase
2 Cor. 6:17	identical
2 Cor. 6:18	close paraphrase
2 Cor. 7: 6	allusion
2 Cor. 8:15	ὀλίγον for ἔλαττον
2 Cor. 8:21	expanded quotation
2 Cor. 9: 7	free paraphrase
2 Cor. 9: 9	identical
2 Cor. 9:10	ἐπιχορηγῶν for δῶ
2 Cor. 10:17	free paraphrase
2 Cor. 13: 1	shortened quotation
	σταθήσεται for στήσεται

The chart above indicates that out of fourteen OT quotations four are identical, two are single word substitutions, one is a close paraphrase, one is a shortened quotation, one is an expanded quotation, four are free paraphrases, and one is a clear allusion. Six of the fourteen follow the LXX quite closely while eight vary in differing degrees.

The special points of agreement in 2 Cor. with other witnesses are as follows:



2 Cor. 3:16	Pseudo Jon. Ex. 33:7 (sense affinity only)
2 Cor. 6:17	a) Lucianic group: 22-48-51-231-763 +90-130-311+36-93-96-86 <sup>C</sup> 534 b) Q 88-Syh 22 <sup>C</sup> -93-456 564 393 544
2 Cor. 8:15	a) n Arm. Boh. b) A <sup>a</sup> Philo σ'
2 Cor. 13: 1	a) A F M N and others b) b d f m n w Arm and others c) b f m w

A cursory comparison of these special points of agreement with those for 1 Cor. shows a few common trends. Apparent in 2 Cor. is a much more striking and textually varied set of agreements compared with the relatively sparse links of 1 Cor. The appearance of the readings of 564 in 1 Cor. is seen again in 2 Cor. as is some further agreement with Q and Syh. It is also of note how the Old Latin and Lucianic groups are apparent in the above chart.

### Conclusion

On textual grounds, therefore, the question of an early Palestinian Greek OT must remain open. One might suppose that if Paul gained the bulk of his biblical training in Jerusalem or Tarsus he would have used a standard OT text in his schooling and that this type of text would surface most often in his quotations. Because one does not find a peculiar non-LXX text surfacing con-

sistently, the long-standing conclusion remains that the apostle used a predecessor reading much like the OT portions surfacing in  $\kappa$  B A.<sup>1</sup> If he used the various texts which would have been available to him at different places on his journeys then one would also expect to see an observable difference in the text of his OT quotations from book to book. This is not the case. What one does find is that Paul basically agrees with the best LXX witnesses, therefore Paul's Greek OT either avoided or, more certainly, preceded many of the variants now apparent in the critical apparatus of the LXX and presents evidence of an early text-type.

The text Paul used implies that the Egyptian Greek OT had come to Palestine with few corruptions and that in Paul's circles this was the Greek Scripture that was the object of study and memorization. If Paul received his training in the mainline circles of first century Judaism one may conclude that the LXX was the Greek Textus Receptus of that period. Therefore the nature of Paul's Palestinian Greek OT is not of the nature of a recension but of an Egyptian Greek OT with scattered variants. The next section will consider this last aspect.

---

<sup>1</sup>See the discussions in Frederick G. Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible (London: Duckworth, 1937), pp. 47-50.

### PART III

#### CONCEPTUAL AND TEXTUAL CONCLUSIONS

Part Three of this paper relates the issues raised in the Part One survey from Harnack to Ulonka concerning continuity between the Testaments to the textual and hermeneutical insights gained in Part Two. In doing so, several conclusions concerning the use of the OT in the NT will be made. The first issue, continuity between the Testaments, will be limited to conceptual relationships. Such relationships are fundamental and formative to the textual and theological linkages between the OT and NT. The second issue concerns the formulations of OT texts for Church usage in the pre-Pauline Christian tradition. This is a logical outgrowth from a conception of continuity. The issue of testimonies will be examined in 1 and 2 Cor. according to the theories of J. R. Harris and C. H. Dodd. The third and final issue is a consideration of what contribution the detailed examination of the OT text-forms in 1 and 2 Cor. can make to the understanding of the Greek OT in first century Palestine.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>While the theories of Cross, Barthélemy, and others are evaluated, at present Barthélemy's school provides the surest footing, thus the terminology used will

## CONCEPTUAL CONTINUITY BETWEEN THE TESTAMENTS

INTRODUCTION

One primary aim of this paper is to investigate the substructure conceptualities which were formulative to the early Christian manipulation of OT texts. This section seeks to bridge the gap between the superficial parallels of thought between the Testaments and the systematization of deeper structure which occasioned the text forms.

Concerning the intention of OT words in passages such as 1 Cor. 9:1f; 10:11, Christian Dietzfelbinger writes:

Worte des Alten Testaments, in einer bestimmten geschichtlichen Situation gesprochen, gelten als Worte, die schon von ihrem ursprünglichen sinn her gesehen die gegenwärtige Situation meinen und deuten.<sup>1</sup>

An underlying hermeneutical vector accounts for the above mentioned phenomenon which forms the central link in the continuity between the Testaments. The first Christians understood a marked continuity between the work of Jesus as Messiah and the content and intent of the Hebrew Scriptures. Such unanimity is not apparent today. Jasper, in a survey of the continuity-discontinuity

---

predominantly follow his definitions.

<sup>1</sup>Dietzfelbinger, PAT, p. 34.

debate, holds that the category of promise is the "best 'theological' link we can discover."<sup>1</sup> To the early Christians theirs was not a new religion purely fulfilled in the Messiah. The apparent newness, interpreted as such by opposing Jewish leaders, was attributed to their basic misunderstanding of Scripture, not to any imported novelty of Jesus' followers. Jesus came to fulfil, not destroy. Thus began the Church's apologetic process of displaying the true interpretation of the Bible to Jews and Gentiles alike. Behind this process of interpreting present events in terms of OT history lay the conviction that there was no discontinuity between the God of the OT and the God of the New. Paul's OT-NT link was essentially the promise and faithfulness of God and secondarily historical continuity or a series of events.<sup>2</sup>

#### THE PERSON AND ACTS OF GOD

The essence of continuity between the Testaments for Paul was therefore the Person and activity of God. Without this fact his coincidences of language and thought

---

<sup>1</sup>F. N. Jasper, "The Relation Of The Old Testament To The New," Expository Times 78 (1967), p. 270. See Commission Foi et Constitution, "La Relation Entre L'Ancien Et Le Nouveau Testament," Istina 20 (1975), pp. 253-61, for a recent ecclesiastical statement of the problem. D. L. Baker, TTOB, provides the most complete and current examination of the entire problem.

<sup>2</sup>Goppelt, Int. 20:322. Dodd, AS, p. 138, notes that the NT writers built upon the prophets' understanding of history.

lose much of their importance. Conceptual affinity is organic to the continuity of deity.<sup>1</sup>

This theological link is best seen in Paul's specific references to God's activity in the Past. God is seen in the act of creation;<sup>2</sup> the superintendence of Israel in the wilderness;<sup>3</sup> and in the land itself.<sup>4</sup> Paul's application of these activities of God to the Corinthians has its basis in the fact that the same God ruled their lives and made the same moral demands.

Topically, this theological link is seen in Paul's discussion of the subject of wisdom;<sup>5</sup> generosity in the ministry;<sup>6</sup> divine acts of judgment;<sup>7</sup> and acts of hope and salvation.<sup>8</sup> These topics are structured upon the acts of God accomplished or prophesied in the OT,

---

<sup>1</sup>Carrez, RSPT 55:92, writes that "si le Dieu Père de notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ cesse d'être le promoteur mystérieux et puissant du mouvement qui traverse l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testaments, de ses événements salutaires" then one cannot legitimately speak of an essential affinity.

<sup>2</sup>1 Cor. 15:45.

<sup>3</sup>2 Cor. 8:15; 3:16; 1 Cor. 5:13; 10:5, 7, 20.

<sup>4</sup>1 Cor. 14:21.

<sup>5</sup>1 Cor. 1:19, 31; 2:9, 16; 3:19-20; 2 Cor. 3:16.

<sup>6</sup>1 Cor. 9:9; 2 Cor. 8:15, 21; 9:7, 9-10.

<sup>7</sup>Temporal: 1 Cor. 5:13; 10:5, 7; 14:21.  
Eschatological: 1 Cor. 14:25, 27; 15:54-55.

<sup>8</sup>2 Cor. 4:13; 6:2, 16-18; 7:6.

thereby linking the same God from Israel's past history up to her final restoration. Finally, the fact that, for Paul, the Church was the new Israel clearly shows his unbroken line with Yahweh of old.

#### THE PLAN OF GOD

The understanding of the early Church that the God of the OT was indeed at work in Jesus the Messiah would in itself presuppose that what God had said in the OT regarding the Messiah could be seen and identified in the past and present experience of the Christ. The salvific plan of God had been carried out. The second thread of continuity in the minds of the NT writers was therefore that of the plan of God for history. The NT insists that such identification and continuity was not an invention of the Christian exegete or a twisting of OT history. With regard to 1 Cor. 10:11a Samuel Amsler writes:

L'apôtre insiste sur le fait que ce sont les événements eux-mêmes, tels qu'ils se sont historiquement déroulés et tels qu'ils nous sont rapportés dans l'Écriture qui correspondent providentiellement aux réalités eschatologiques (1 Cor. 10:11a).<sup>1</sup>

This assertion of historicity is intertwined with the above-noted continuity of the person of God between the Old and New covenants.

The moral plan of God is implied in the imperatives

---

<sup>1</sup>Amsler, ATE, pp. 57-58.

attached to most of the OT quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. but the most clearly enunciated passages concerning God's historical plan are seen in the promises for Israel's new age. In 1 Cor. 15:27, 54-55, Paul adopted the prophecies concerning God's ultimate subjection of all hostile foes. In 2 Cor. 6:16-18 the nation was offered sonship and the continual presence of God. In 2 Cor. 7:1 Paul called these offers promises (ἐπαγγελίας) for the new Israel, the Church. Thus the Church was placed into the ongoing plan of God for His chosen people.

### Jesus As The Christ

Introduction. The plan of God and its resultant continuity between the Testaments is best seen in the assertion that Jesus of Nazareth was Israel's long-awaited Messiah to whom the OT prophecies concerning God's anointed one could be ascribed. This formed Paul's pre-understanding by which he approached the interpretation of the OT.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Carl Michalson, "Bultmann Against Marcion," from The Old Testament And Christian Faith, ed. W. Anderson (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1964), writes concerning pre-understanding in general: "Preunderstanding is a method of putting questions to a body of historical material where the questions originate in one's own concern for living. Where that occurs, the material cannot be an indifferent object of investigation;" p. 52. Prosper Grech, "The 'Testimonia' And Modern Hermeneutics," New Testament Studies 19 (1973), pp. 320-21, notes that this understanding "is a subjective one, but it is not arbitrary, it is hermeneutical." See Geoffrey Turner, "Pre-Understanding And New Testament Interpretation," Scottish Journal of Theology 28 (1975), pp. 241-42, for this discussion in relation to the problem of historie and geschichte.



Much of Paul's OT interpretation, therefore, cannot be understood on the basis of his Jewish training or Hellenistic assimilations alone. Of course Paul retained much of the literary and conceptual forms of Judaism but the center of his life and methodology was no longer the Law but the Messiah.<sup>1</sup> It is, of course, both instructive and necessary to understand the cultural and religious affinities of Paul's hermeneutic with Hellenistic Judaism. These, however, are not the only two options available for reconstructing his hermeneutical assumptions. Paul's own religious experience as well as that of the Christian community played major, if not decisive, roles in the shaping of his apperception of Scripture. One must meet Paul at the self-avowed<sup>2</sup> center of his life and thought in order to represent accurately his use of the OT.

Paul's religious experience was encapsulated in the concept that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ. Some practical expression of what this identification meant for Paul are found in the Corinthian correspondence.

---

<sup>1</sup>C. K. Barrett, "Paul's Opponents In II Corinthians," *New Testament Studies* 17 (1970-71), p. 254. Geza Vermes, *CHB I*, p. 199, writes concerning midrashic commentary that its "point of departure was no longer Torah itself, but contemporary customs and beliefs which the interpreter attempted to connect with Scripture and to justify." Vermes calls this "applied exegesis" and notes that this seemed to accompany the emergence of various religious factions, p. 221. This is clearly seen in the early Christian community's apologetic and exegetical efforts.

<sup>2</sup>Phil. 1:21a.

Basic and formative conceptions which are found throughout all of Paul's letters relate to the resurrection of Jesus, the Damascus road experience of Paul, and these events functioning as a ground for OT usage. These three aspects will be viewed in relation to 1 and 2 Cor.

### The Resurrection of the Christ

For Paul, the understanding of the true identity of Jesus was, above all, grounded in and revealed through the resurrection. This was fundamental to the very inception and existence of the Church.<sup>1</sup> This event became the anchor for the faith of the new community and also radically altered its study of the Bible. While the form of the study was, in the main, midrashic, the new community interpreted the OT both according to the content of the teaching of Jesus and by the amazing post-Easter experiences of the Apostles.<sup>2</sup> The resurrection became a sign-

---

<sup>1</sup>Holtz, TL 99:27, writes: "Vor allem aber ist ein Ereignis gewesen, das in der Gemeinde von allem Anfang an die Gewissheit gegründet haben muss, im Anbruch der Endzeit zu leben, ein Ereignis, das geradezu die Geburtsstunde der Gemeinde gewesen ist. Das was die Erfahrung der Auferstehung des gekreuzigten Jesus."

<sup>2</sup>Gerhardsson, MM, p. 331. Lindars, NTA, pp. 27-28, finds that this perspective makes the interpretive alteration of passages necessary and valid. Fitzmyer, NTS 7:297-333, finds no equivalent of Christian fulfillment or realization motifs in Qumran's use of the OT. The basic outlook of Qumran was the forward look to the future while Christianity was characterized by the backward look to Israel's history.

post pointing the early Church to an interpretive path which, in ever widening circles, would come to encompass much of the OT and direct the community's present exuberance and future hopes.

The resurrection of Christ caused Him to become (ἐγενήθη, 1 Cor. 1:30) the wisdom, righteousness and redemption of God, thereby making Him the ground and focus of all boasting (1 Cor. 1:31). Though no OT examples are supplied in 1 Cor. 15:3-4, this passage shows that the resurrection was according to an OT pattern. The fact that no OT passage is used in 1 and 2 Cor. to support Christ's resurrection shows that Paul was not called upon to defend the event. As distinct from the gospels, Paul was occupied with bringing the OT to bear on the actions of the Church as God's new and elect people, rather than to support the actions of Jesus on earth by OT verses. Paul's words in 1 Cor. 15:3-4, however, presuppose the type of detailed exposition of Christ's life such as we find in the gospels. While no OT quotation is mustered to substantiate Christ's resurrection in 1 and 2 Cor. the OT basis is ubiquitous and presupposed.

The Damascus Road Experience of Paul. Paul himself plainly stated that his appreciation of Jesus as the Christ had its genesis outside of Damascus. This was the inauguration not only of a totally new religious exper-

ience but also of a totally new hermeneutical understanding of the OT.<sup>1</sup> What was once for Paul an open-ended religious history of the acts of God in Israel became an identifiable summation: the Messiah had come and He was Jesus. Paul now had a history which included the key to its meaning. The thesis and antithesis involved in Jesus' claim to be Messiah was only synthesized for Paul in the personal experience of Jesus as Messiah and the hermeneutical conformation of the OT data around this experience. Ragnar Bring writes concerning Paul's conflict:

Für ihn stellt sich die Frage, was Jesus bedeutet. Als Pharisäer hat er ihn als einen Verführer angesehen, nach Damaskus als den Messias und den Sohn Gottes.<sup>2</sup>

In answering the question as to the meaning of Jesus, Paul displayed his hermeneutical assumptions and methods. While stressing the Damascus road experience in the formation of Paul's OT interpretation, however, one must not overlook the importance of Paul's Jewish affinities. Gerhardsson strikes a proper note of caution regarding methodology:

Was the apostle so logical in his theory and so gifted in his practice that he could base his entire thought and action on one doctrinal point, so that we are

---

<sup>1</sup>Leonhard Goppelt, "Paulus Und Die Heilsgeschichte: Schlussfolgerungen Aus Röm. IV Und I Kor. X. 1-13," New Testament Studies 13 (1966), p. 42.

<sup>2</sup>Ragnar Bring, Christus Und Das Gesetz (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969), p. 159.

able to solve the historical problems connected with his life simply by a process of deduction from his soteriological focus?<sup>1</sup>

The corrective to this error will be a separation between theological perspective and theological-exegetical method. While Gerhardsson's conclusions differ from this writer's, such a methodological distinction has been found to be helpful.

A Ground for Interpretation. In discovering for himself how Jesus could be the Messiah, Paul entered into a circle of students in the Church at large who were searching the Scriptures to find answers to the same question.<sup>2</sup> In this stream of interpretation the reality of Christ's presence in the believers' experience brought a new immediacy to the OT. This is exemplified in Paul's use of *καιρος εὐπροσδέκτος* and *ἡμέρα σωτηρίας* as that which had already come.<sup>3</sup> This formed the perspective by which Paul both viewed and understood the OT. C. H. Dodd and L. Goppelt believe that Christ Himself inaugurated this method of interpretation before the crucifixion and

---

<sup>1</sup>Gerhardsson, T&T, pp. 29-30.

<sup>2</sup>Amsler, ATE, p. 10, writes: "Poser le problème de l'interprétation de l'Ancien Testament dans l'Eglise chrétienne signifie le poser sur cette base précise que Jésus de Nazareth est bien le Christ annoncé et promis dans l'Ancien Testament."

<sup>3</sup>Holtz, IAT, p. 26, notes that "die Thora im 'jetzt' der Gerechtheitsoffenbarung ohne das Gesetz (weil im Christusglauben) zu ihrem Ziel kommt, sagt Rom 3,21 ausdrückliche." Cf. Mat. 11:13 and Jn. 5:46b.

they are not alone.<sup>1</sup>

The presentness and immediacy brought about by the realization that Jesus was the Christ meant that the redeeming work of Yahweh was now centered in Jesus.<sup>2</sup> As 2 Cor. 3:16 shows, the hermeneutical key to OT interpretation was the identification of Jesus as Messiah. Only there, according to Paul, could the veil be lifted from men's minds enabling them to receive the wisdom of God. Thus the redemptive promises of the OT could be applied to Jesus in His past and present act and the context of the OT became that of the Christian Gospel based on the death and resurrection of Jesus.<sup>3</sup> This contemporizing is seen at Qumran by the community's adoption of names like

---

<sup>1</sup>Dodd, AS, p. 110. Goppelt, Int. 21:318. Both Lindars and Borgen, "The Place Of The Old Testament In The Formation Of New Testament Theology: Prolegomena And Response," New Testament Studies 23 (1976), pp. 59-75, trace OT-NT hermeneutic back to Christ as do the following: Bleddyn J. Roberts, "The Dead Sea Scrolls And The Old Testament Scriptures," Reprinted from the Bulletin Of The John Rylands Library 36 (1953), p. 84; T. W. Manson, "The Old Testament In The Teaching Of Jesus," Reprinted from the Bulletin Of The John Rylands Library 34 (1952), p. 332; Gundry, MUOT, pp. 213-15; Oscar Cullmann, "The Connection Of Primal Events And End Events With The New Testament Redemptive History," The Old Testament And Christian Faith, ed. Bernhard W. Anderson, ET Louis Martyn (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1964), pp. 115-23. G. W. Grogan, "The New Testament Interpretation Of The Old Testament," Tyndale Bulletin 18 (1967), pp. 75-76. Joseph Coppens, Les Harmonies Des Deux Testaments (Tournai-Paris: Casterman, 1949), pp. 36ff, sees Christ as the source of the concept of sensus plenior.

<sup>2</sup>See Gottlob Schrenk, "γράφω," TDNT I, p. 759.

<sup>3</sup>Grech, NTS 19:319.

camp, מִחֲנֶה, community, יֹחֵד, and teacher of righteousness, מוֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק, to show how Scripture had been fulfilled in their existence.<sup>1</sup> Just how Paul applied his Heilsweg approach to the OT in 1 and 2 Cor. will be seen below.

Paul, to be sure, used the OT to bring a divine comment to bear on a practical problem at hand. 1 and 2 Cor. are practical letters which systematically spoke to various issues in the Church. Paul had evaluated the Church problems against a well defined understanding of what was the proper procedure for the Christian community. One would suppose that he had worked out biblical reasoning for the major points of his new belief during the years prior to his first visits to Corinth. If this be accepted, Paul would have had a background from which to draw when faced with the problems of the Corinthians. One would also assume that he spent some time in consideration of the matter before he commenced composing his reply.

What is of prime importance is the centrality of Jesus as Messiah in Paul's thought. It is not enough for

---

<sup>1</sup>Bleddyn J. Roberts, "Bible Exegesis And Fulfillment In Qumran," Words And Meanings, eds. Peter R. Ackroyd and Barnabas Lindars (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1968), pp. 195-207, asks if this conceptualization might not be present also in the writers of the Gospels. Braun, ZTK 59:24, writes: "Diese Voraussetzung wird dann im Zitieren praktiziert, ohne dass du Kontext des alttestamentlichen Zitates und das theologische Koordinatensystem, in welchem das Zitat seinen Sitz hat, Berücksichtigung findet."



Paul to have known that the Messiah was to come. The radical shift came when Jesus was declared to be this Messiah. O. Michel, in his classic study of Paul and the OT, wrote "dass im Mittelpunkt aller Auslegung Christus stehen muss. Das lehrt uns Paulus."<sup>1</sup> Thus the OT did not lose its power for Paul but rather the opposite; it was strengthened.<sup>2</sup>

It may be said, at the outset of this discussion of the OT passages referring to the Messiah in 1 and 2 Cor., that Paul's Christocentric hermeneutic in no way blurs the Father's ultimate supremacy. 1 and 2 Cor. are highly Father-centered and behind each act of the Messiah is the inaugurating power of the Father. The OT passages referring to the Messiah fall into three categories: 1) The new way of salvation; 2) The new Israel; 3) The reign of the Messiah. Behind all three, God the Father stands as originator.

The New Way of Salvation. The content of Paul's wisdom was the crucified Messiah.<sup>3</sup> By this wisdom, which was foolish in the eyes of the world, God destroyed false human wisdom.<sup>4</sup> The boasting, encouraged by the OT quota-

---

<sup>1</sup>Michel, P&SB, p. 212.

<sup>2</sup>Harnack, ATPB, p. 124.

<sup>3</sup>Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, 1 Cor. 1:23.

<sup>4</sup>As per the quotation of 1 Cor. 1:19.



tion of 1 Cor. 1:31, is focused on the act of God by which He caused the Messiah, Jesus,<sup>1</sup> to become the true wisdom of God. The OT asserted that man should boast in Yahweh and His acts. Paul asserted that man should boast in Yahweh<sup>2</sup> and His acts in the Messiah. Here is seen the typical Pauline continuation of an OT moral principle as elaborated by the specifics of the New Covenant.

The Messiah also became the means by which the plans of God were revealed to the new community.<sup>3</sup> The argument had been established that no man could know the thoughts of God except His own Spirit. The OT quotation of 1 Cor. 2:16 reinforced this fact. For Paul, however, the Messiah formed the link with the mind of God. The anointed One was anointed with the Spirit of God and had graciously bestowed this Spirit to men. This also reinforces the fact that the κύριος of the quotation was Yahweh and not His Messiah.

The eschatological aspect of the new way of salvation is seen in 1 Cor. 15:54-55. The resurrection of Messiah had become the paradigm for Paul's discussion of the believers' resurrection.<sup>4</sup> 1 Cor. 15:45 shows the

---

<sup>1</sup>Χριστῷ ᾧ Ἰησοῦ, 1 Cor. 1:30.

<sup>2</sup>κυρίῳ, 1 Cor. 1:31.

<sup>3</sup>1 Cor. 2:16.

<sup>4</sup>1 Cor. 15:12ff.

continuity of the human race with the Second Adam as well as the discontinuity, but the pattern of human resurrection would follow the Messiah's. According to the Church as the new Israel conceptuality, 1 Cor. 15:54 was drawn from the Isaiah passages referring to the restoration and bliss of the Jewish nation. Thus these few OT quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. show that the basic structure of Pauline soteriology followed the lines of faith in the long-awaited Messiah, now known to be Jesus of Nazareth, and the appropriation of Israel's promises by the new elect of God, the Church.

The Church as the New Israel. Specifically, the quotations which indicate that Paul saw the Church as the new Israel of God are found in the application of the wilderness motif to Christian piety. As the community of God, the Church was to keep pure<sup>1</sup> and cast out the evil among its ranks. The idolatry of the wilderness was to be avoided.<sup>2</sup> The support of the ministry received the Sinaitic Law authority.<sup>3</sup> The equal provision of manna became a lesson in Christian generosity.<sup>4</sup>

Examples of faith and thanksgiving were drawn

---

<sup>1</sup>1 Cor. 5:13.

<sup>2</sup>1 Cor. 10:7.

<sup>3</sup>1 Cor. 9:9.

<sup>4</sup>2 Cor. 8:15. No OT quotation is provided but the Messiah is presented as being present with Israel in the wilderness in 1 Cor. 10:4.

from the Psalms.<sup>1</sup> The divine judgment and presence with the nation Israel continued within the Church in tongues<sup>2</sup> and God's presence among the members of the Church.

The Reign of Messiah. Christ's reign is explained in 1 Cor. 15:25, 27 from the perspective of the subjection of His enemies. The Messiah was reigning in order to consummate His kingdom by glorifying His elect,<sup>3</sup> bringing His enemies to nought,<sup>4</sup> and delivering the kingdom over to the Father.<sup>5</sup> The OT quotation provided the framework for these assertions.

#### CONTINUATION OF OT PIETY

Having discussed the person and plan of God, the third understanding which would give rise to the hermeneutical results of continuity between the Testaments is that of the God-man relationship. The basic element of the manward side of this intercourse was, for Paul, still faith and obedient trust.<sup>6</sup> Even in light of the soteriological revolution which took place in the theology of the Christian community, the essence of piety was never-

---

<sup>1</sup>1 Cor. 10:26; 2 Cor. 4:13.

<sup>2</sup>1 Cor. 14:21, 25.

<sup>3</sup>1 Cor. 15:23.

<sup>4</sup>1 Cor. 15:24b.

<sup>5</sup>1 Cor. 15:24a.

<sup>6</sup>2 Cor. 4:13. Braun, ATNT, p. 30, writes: "Die wirkliche Klammer zwischen beiden Testamenten liegt vielmehr in der Art, wie Gott und Mensch verstanden sind. Der Mensch soll das Rechte tun im Gehorsam, in Trauen. . . ."

theless still grounded in and extended from the OT history. This is seen in the explicit quotations where there is a real parallel between Israel and the Church.<sup>1</sup>

### TYPOLOGY

The understanding of the God-man relationship and the continuity of the person and design of God resulted in a distinctive hermeneutic: typology. This was a central and exegetically determinative conceptuality in Paul's thought.<sup>2</sup> Typology is not an exegetical procedure, but rather a way of thinking about the relationships between the present and the OT text.<sup>3</sup> In this approach to the OT the historical and religious continuity could be maintained without allegorizing the former or spiritualizing the latter. Goppelt contrasts Paul with others on this very point:

Das sich Paulus zur Stützung seiner Lehre der typologischen und nicht wie Philo oder Origenes der allegorischen und symbolischen Schriftdeutung bedient, ist ein Zeichen dafür, dass es hier nicht um Gnosis, sondern um Glauben nicht um eine verfügbare Erlösungsidee oder vorfindliche mystische Erfahrung (der "geist" ist nie naturhaften Habitus), sondern um heilsgeschichtliche Glaubewirklichkeit geht.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Manson, OTTJ, p. 331. This is seen in 1 Cor. 1:19; 2:9; 3:19-20; 9:9; 15:54-55.

<sup>2</sup>Goppelt, Int. 21:315. See Ro. 4:23; Gal. 3:8; 1 Cor. 10:6. Smith, UOTN, p. 37, n. 93, says Goppelt, Int. 21:239, goes too far in seeing typology as the dominant form of the NT use of the OT.

<sup>3</sup>Baker, TTOB, p. 258.

<sup>4</sup>Goppelt, Typ., p. 163.

Such an approach was a manifestly historical appeal both to the type and antitype. The NT claim to continuity was based on the historical phenomena<sup>1</sup> of God's acts in Israel.

There is a difference between the use of typology in the Gospels as over against Paul. The former have a distinct use of typology for "Heilsgeschichte" whereas Paul's primary use was for "Heilslehre."<sup>2</sup> Woollcombe notes that there are two types of typological method; one which is a method of exegesis and the other which is a method of writing. The former is based on etymological considerations while the latter is based on an apparent historical connection.<sup>3</sup> Both forms are seen in the Gospels and Paul. Another distinction can be made from

---

<sup>1</sup>Paul Beauchamp, "L'Interprétation Figurative Et Ses Présupposés," Recherches De Science Religieuse 63 (1975), pp. 299-312, sees the historical-typological link to be the two creations; the new creation fulfills and illuminates the old. Samuel Amsler, "Le Dernier Et L'Avant-Dernier," Recherches De Science Religieuse 63 (1975), pp. 385-96, constructs the link from Christ as the "last event" to the OT as the penultimate event which when reread in light of the last event gains its meaning. See also Goppelt, ATE, p. 19, and most recently, Baker, TTOB, pp. 239-68.

<sup>2</sup>Goppelt, Typ., p. 154. This distinction, however, may be more finely drawn between Romans (Heilsgeschichte) and 1 and 2 Cor. (Heilslehre). However, as was said above, p. 73, this is a more functional than objective distinction and one which most likely was not an active object in the first century mind.

<sup>3</sup>G. W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woollcombe, Essays On Typology (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1957), p. 154.

the use of τύπος in the NT as both a matrix and its impression.<sup>1</sup>

The matter of Christology also relates to the historical continuity and typological interpretation of the Testaments. As the fullness of God, Christ was the focus and basis of typology. Goppelt writes:

Die Antitypen sind, gleich den Typen, nicht irgendwelche weltimmanenten Ausserlichkeiten, sondern die Grundzüge des vollendeten Gottesverhältnisses.<sup>2</sup>

Each typological reference is ascertained, not by allegory, but by reference from events in the OT to events that happened to Christ and His community. Amsler describes the difference of typology from allegory:

Pour Paul, la dépendance des types à l'égard des antitypes n'exprime donc pas la participation métaphysique des premiers aux seconds, mais l'anticipation historique des seconds par les premiers. A leur tour, les types ne sont pas seulement les "figures" des antitypes; ils en sont les "prefigures": la relation typologique est une relation historique ou temporelle.<sup>3</sup>

This historical and temporal correspondence is based on

---

<sup>1</sup>In Ro. 5:14 and 1 Cor. 10:6 the word refers to an impression but in Ro. 6:17 and Phil. 3:17 it denotes a pattern or model. Note Acts 7:43-44 for the use of τύπος incorporating the only two places when it is used in the OT (Amos 5:26; Ex. 25:40); cf. Woollcombe, ET, p. 61.

<sup>2</sup>Goppelt, Typ., p. 244.

<sup>3</sup>Samuel Amsler, La Typologie De L'Ancien Testament Chez Saint-Paul (Lausanne: Imprimerie La Concorde, 1949), p. 11.

event<sup>1</sup> rather than on the artificial affinity of allegory which misses the true intent of the object of the allegory.<sup>2</sup> The root of Paul's interpretation is found in

---

<sup>1</sup>Lampe, ET, p. 14. This use of event must be distinguished from Goppelt's use, Typ., p. 256, where he says a work becomes allegory when it points to a fulfillment of event rather than to a definitive something else. Goppelt refers to the essential features of God's actions rather than the outward form of the events. Vermes, CHB I:410-11, writes that typology "looks not to the fulfillment of a prediction, but to the recurrence of a pattern" though prophecy and pattern are frequently intertwined. Friedrich Büchsel, TDNT I:260, shows the contrast of allegory: "It occurs with a certain regularity where an authoritative tradition is outstripped by development but is neither discarded nor interpreted historically." Büchsel's conclusion is that there is no difference in principle but only in kind between Palestinian and Alexandrian allegorising. This includes Paul, p. 263, though Christianity does form a new beginning in the field. Michel, P&SB, p. 110, on the other hand, asserts the essential historicity of Palestinian typology and says that Paul did not allegorise in the true sense.

<sup>2</sup>R. E. Nixon, The Exodus In The New Testament (London: The Tyndale Press, 1963), p. 11. The end product of Philo's allegory did have practical significance, however. Lala Kalyan Kumar Dey, The Intermediary World And Patterns Of Perfection In Philo And Hebrews (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975), SBL Dissertation Series, p. 12, has shown how Philo had various patterns of thought which rendered comprehensible the customs of the OT for Hellenistic concepts. With regard to the changeability of titles and functions for the intermediary world Dey writes: "This pattern of identifications and correlations is a part of the hermeneutics of Philo, through which stories in the OT acquire eternal and therefore contemporary significance." These patterns of thought are held to be the key to Philo's thought as contrasted with studies which merely study the synthetic and genetic use of words and passages, p. 17. This has implications for the study of Paul's use of the OT. It was Paul's conceptuality, not his methodology, that allowed him to contemporize the OT for the use of the Church.



the historical content of the last things as seen in Christ whereas Philo "reinterpreted historical events as symbolizing processes in the human soul. . . ." <sup>1</sup>

Typology was appropriated because of the presuppositions of continuity in the early Church. An apocalyptic perspective may account in part for Paul's doctrine of aeons which stands behind his typology. <sup>2</sup> However, TB Sanhedrin 97a also mentions aeons: one period of 2,000 years of Law to be followed by 2,000 years of Messianic rule and M Tamid 7:4 mentions 2,000 years of Sabbath rest. This implies that the Law was temporary until the days of Messiah would begin. <sup>3</sup> Lampe even suggests that

---

<sup>1</sup>Schoeps, Paul, p. 233. Dey, IWPB, p. 17, notes a process of conceptuality at work in Philo which has implications for the understanding of Paul's hermeneutic as well. In a discussion of how logos, archangel, prophet, and angels become mediators between God and man, creation and creator, Dey writes: "The manner in which Philo introduces these features of the intermediary world in that they are interjected into contexts which as such are not concerned with the question of creation reveals a pattern of thought in Philo. This pattern in respect to creation and mediation is triggered by an "associative" mode of exposition (i.e., word-associations). . . . One of the keys to the understanding and interpretation of Philo would be to locate patterns of thought which are triggered by means of associative terms in the process of his exposition of the passages of the OT." This insight is strikingly similar to that of Kadushin, CAM, in his study of early Jewish thought. See also Daniel Patte, Early Jewish Hermeneutic In Palestine (Missoula, Montana: Society Of Biblical Literature And Scholars Press, 1975), pp. 49-86.

<sup>2</sup>Schoeps, Paul, p. 42.

<sup>3</sup>F. F. Bruce, "Paul And The Law Of Moses," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 57 (1975), p. 263.



"all indications show that it was a process initiated by Christ himself."<sup>1</sup> Goppelt points out an approach taken by the NT writers:

Die ntl Typologie Frage nicht: Welchen Sinn hat jene atl Geschichte oder Einrichtung? Sondern sie vergleicht Jesus und das in ihm erschiene Heil mit den atl Parallelen und stellt fest, was sich daraus für das Neue und von hier aus unter Umständen für das Alte ergibt.<sup>2</sup>

It would be understandable for the community to compare its memories of Jesus with the Scripture to find correspondences. With such a concept of continuity this was to be expected.

This was carried out consistently even to the point where the OT became the authority over personal opinion. That is not to say that there were not commonly understood beliefs regarding the Messiah prior to Jesus. The fact is that these pre-Christian beliefs<sup>3</sup> had to be subjected to the new light brought by Jesus and the Spirit after Him.

Regarding 1 Cor. 10:11, Michel<sup>4</sup> stresses that the OT receives its meaning from the endtime. However, the content of the end time is somewhat shaped by the OT as

---

<sup>1</sup>Lampe, ET, p. 25.

<sup>2</sup>Goppelt, Typ., p. 243.

<sup>3</sup>For example the NT shows current questions regarding the origin of Messiah from Nazareth, His crucifixion and plans for the Kingdom.

<sup>4</sup>Michel, P&SB, p. 134.

well.<sup>1</sup> The content of such interpretation was not achieved by mere grammatical exegesis alone. A typological relationship was ascertained by the discovery and interpretation of the truth and reality to which the texts testified.<sup>2</sup> Thus an interpretational key arises based both on the concept of continuity, a concept not foreign to Judaism, and on the concept of progressive revelation.

Each time an IF is used in 1 and 2 Cor. an event correspondence is implicit. The grammatical functions of the particles or adverbs which may be included in the IF serve to strengthen this correspondence. Ulonska,<sup>3</sup> asserts that the link is only illustrative and contains no theological or historical implications but this runs counter to the pervasive mind-set of Jewish interpretation from earliest times. Paul's Jewish training gave him the sense of the importance of Torah in all aspects of life. Torah was more than illustration, it was a continuing

---

<sup>1</sup>Goppelt, Typ., p. 244 writes: "Die Typologie ist keine hermeneutische Method, welche nach bestimmten Regeln Deutungen ermittelt, sondern eine pneumatische Betrachtungsweise, welche im Blick auf die Heilsvollendung von Fall zu Fall in der vorlaufenden Heilsgeschichte deren Typen erkennt."

<sup>2</sup>Amsler, TAT, p. 17. D. Otto Schmitz, "Das Alte Testament Im Neuen Testament," from Wort Und Geist (Berlin: Im Furche-Verlag, 1934), p. 72, notes that the foundation of the OT in the NT was "eine eigentümliches Doppelverhältnis heilsgeschichtlicher Dialektik, das seine einheitliche Bestimmtheit aus der neuen Heils-situation empfängt."

<sup>3</sup>Ulonska, FAZA, passim.

history of the acts of Yahweh. It was not referred to as an expendable illustration but as the legitimizing foundation of any position. To quote the OT was to bring divine authority to one's statements.

Thus the underlying basis of typology for Paul was God's continuing presence. To say ἵνα καθὼς γέγραπται (1 Cor. 1:31a) relative to boasting in Jeremiah's day, was to assert that the same was true in Corinth because Yahweh and His Torah were the same now as they were then. Therefore, one aspect of the typological connection is the ongoing continuity of deity.

It has been mentioned throughout the paper that Paul's use of the OT in 1 and 2 Cor. is based on historical event (typology) rather than on allegory. This is clearly seen in the classification of typological subjects in 1 and 2 Cor. We are using the word type in its broadest sense of "example."<sup>1</sup> All of these subjects are based on acts of God in history which, in varying degrees, are used as indicators of God's character or man's obligations to God and the community.

The typology of Paul was based on the history of Israel but also was infused with a progression in revelation's content. Progressive revelation was already

---

<sup>1</sup>God's wisdom over man's: 1 Cor. 1:19; 2:16; 3:19-20. Piety, boasting: 1 Cor. 1:31, in Yahweh's acts, one flesh from creation 6:16; 10:26, faith 2 Cor. 4:13, 9:9. Church as Israel: 1 Cor. 2:9; 5:13; 9:9; 10:5, 7; 14:21, 25; 15:27; 45; 54-55; 2 Cor. 6:2; 16-18; 8:15, 21; 13:1.

inherent in Judaism's expectation of the future restoration of Israel. The concept of unfulfilled prophecy implied that a time would come when the prophecy would occur in history and at that point the prophecy would be understood in new ways in the light of being fleshed out in all its historical and experiential specificity. To speculate a little, it is not <sup>in</sup> conceivable that a Jew would, when his Messiah arrived in time and space, find new insights into old passages which he had viewed as Messianic and would find that new ones had come to light in view of his now more perfect understanding of what Yahweh had in mind for the restoration. This, in essence, is what occurred for Paul when Jesus became the Messiah. Old passages took on new meaning and entire new sections were seen to be relative to God's redemptive and national purposes. Amsler writes:

Ainsi la relation providentielle, historique et christocentrique qui les lie est-elle toujours, dans l'herméneutique paulinienne, une relation pro-gressive.<sup>1</sup>

Such insight was viewed as revelational based on the personal and structural continuity of God's work in history.

To have such a perspective was a radical confrontation to the norms of Judaism. To assert that Scripture was a testimony to the Gospel but was recogniz-

---

<sup>1</sup>Amsler, ATE, p. 60. See D. L. Baker, Two Testaments, One Bible (London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1976), pp. 76-79, for a history of the term "progressive revelation" from the early twentieth century to the present.

able as such only after the fact was, in relation to current Judaism, "une révolution copernicienne."<sup>1</sup>

Judaism concerned itself with making Torah applicable to daily life but without adding to or taking away from it<sup>2</sup> while Christianity offered not only a new interpretation of the Law but added to the revelational content of religion as well.

Renard has remarked that the most important aspect of the divergence between Judaism and Christianity was just such a development of progress in revelation as accomplished and centered in Jesus.<sup>3</sup> While it is not always easy, one must ask when Paul was centered on the continuity of Scripture and when was he centered on the discontinuity. Carrez questions if this is simply an unordered "processus charismatique eclectique" which functions situationally in varying circumstances as Paul brings OT quotations to bear.<sup>4</sup> However, not only did Paul see a direction in history, which he shared with his

---

<sup>1</sup>Amsler, ATE, p. 97.

<sup>2</sup>Henri Renard, "La Lecture De L'Ancien Testament Par Saint Paul," Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus, Vol. 2 (Rome: E Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1963), p. 208.

<sup>3</sup>Renard, SPCI II, p. 210. This controversy was not to remain outside the camp of Christianity as second century Marcionism demonstrates.

<sup>4</sup>Maurice Carrez, "La Méthode De G. von Rad Appliquée A Quelques Textes Pauliniens," Revue Des Sciences Philosophiques Et Theologiques 55 (1971), p. 86.

fellow countrymen, and not only did he see a significance<sup>1</sup> to this history, which was also shared, but he had received the specificity of that signification. There is a distinction between the Epistles of Paul which view the Church in relation to its meaning vis-a-vis Christ rather than the coming of Christ to the Church as in the Gospels. Thus the subject of typology with Paul was not so much the Person of Christ but His Church as His members.<sup>2</sup>

It would appear, then, that typology was an inductively appropriated perspective which was given a lasting invigoration by the resurrection experiences of the Church. Such a perspective demonstrated the unity of revelation. Dietzfelbinger concludes regarding Paul's use of one instance of typology, that of the Abraham history:

Damit hält er die Kontinuität zwischen Alten und Neuen Testament fest und darin die Kontinuität des Weges Gottes mit der Menschheit; damit hält er aber auch fest die Einheit der Offenbarung.<sup>3</sup>

Michel claims that to understand Paul aright when he

---

<sup>1</sup>Gaston Courtade, "Le Sens De L'Histoire Dans L'Ecriture Et La Classification Usuelle Des Sens Scripturaires," Recherches De Science Religieuse 36 (1949), p. 136.

<sup>2</sup>Goppelt, *Typ.*, p. 154.

<sup>3</sup>Dietzfelbinger, *PAT*, p. 41. He remarks that in the use of Scripture the assumptions and goals serve the facts rather than the other way around, p. 35.

speaks of the Church as Israel<sup>1</sup> and the true temple<sup>2</sup> will provide the perspective "dass der ganze alttestamentliche Ritus typologisch<sup>s</sup> auf des Christentum hinweist."<sup>3</sup>

Finally, the historical moorings subsequent to and inherent in typological thought acted as an apologetic force and doctrinal guard.<sup>4</sup>

### SPIRIT AND LETTER

To identify Jesus with Messiah did not in and of itself become Paul's only key to interpreting aright the OT. The Holy Spirit had a central place in the life and thought of the community not only in charismatic and evangelistic experiences but also in noetic enlightenment regarding the true understanding of Scripture. In light of the assumption that Jesus was the Messiah the concept of Spirit became the hermeneutical basis by which Paul made the documents of the old covenant applicable to

---

<sup>1</sup>Ro. 9:6; Gal. 6:16; 1 Cor. 10:8.

<sup>2</sup>1 Cor. 3:6; 1 Cor. 5:7; Ro. 1:21.

<sup>3</sup>Michel, P&SB, p. 157.

<sup>4</sup>Ephraim E. Urbach, "Halakah And History" from Jews, Greeks and Christians, ed. Robert Hammerton-Kelly (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), p. 120, writes: "There is no doubt that the interest taken in history and events of the past is considered to be important in the development of the Halakah insofar as they serve as a source and guide for its permutations and insofar as they teach man his way in his life and behavior."



the new.<sup>1</sup> It is the detailing of what Spirit means both in theory and practice that causes difference of scholarly opinion.

Michel says that to describe religion as Book- or Spirit-religion must stop for Christianity because "das neutestamentliche Verständnis der Heiligen Schrift fordert, dass die Wortreligion immer Geistreligion ist."<sup>2</sup> The Damascus road experience was not an occasion for Paul to break with the authority of the γραφή but, to the contrary, to seek after a new understanding of his Bible.<sup>3</sup>

Harnack asserts the priority of the Spirit when he concludes that Paul did not use the OT as a "Quellen- und Erbauungsbuch" for the young churches but grounded his teaching in the Gospel and its accompanying Spirit.<sup>4</sup> This concept is based on the view which sees the OT as used basically in the Law-Gospel debates with the Jews and therefore is not a norm for Paul's teaching or methods.<sup>5</sup> Harnack traces the use of the OT throughout

---

<sup>1</sup>Peter Richardson, "Spirit And Letter: A Foundation for Hermeneutics," Evangelical Quarterly 45 (1973), p. 214. See Dan O. Via, "A Structuralist Approach To Paul's Old Testament Hermeneutic," Interpretation 28 (1974), p. 210, for a structuralist application to the Letter/Spirit dialectic.

<sup>2</sup>Michel, P&SB, p. 137.

<sup>3</sup>Michel, P&SB, p. 137.

<sup>4</sup>Harnack, ATPB, p. 137.

<sup>5</sup>For a discussion of Harnack's thesis as modified by Michel, P&SB, and others, see Ellis, PUOT, pp. 28-33.



six pauline letters<sup>1</sup> and concludes that the Apostle had not given the OT to the church or the pagans as simply an "Erbauungsbuch."<sup>2</sup> In these letters Paul does not use express OT citations as the basis of his authority but rather asserts the living Word of God, i.e. the Gospel. Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Galatians contain many uses of the OT introduced by IF while no such usage is found in the previous six Epistles.<sup>3</sup> Both Michel and Harnack imply an important methodological factor: Whatever Spirit and Letter may mean, they must first be defined in the terms of the early church and not according to modern hermeneutic.

The original intention of the Law was to call men into obedience to the will of God and this is compatible with Ro. 3:21 and the Gospel of God. Only when the original intention of Torah was twisted to promote works to gain divine favor was the law identical with the letter.<sup>4</sup> The Jew would view the law from the hermeneutical perspective of "letter" which Paul called a veiled

---

Thackeray, RPJT, p. 192, writes to the contrary that for Paul, "the Bible is constantly regarded as a lesson-book for Christians."

<sup>1</sup>1 & 2 Thess.; Col.; Phil.; Philemon; Eph.

<sup>2</sup>Harnack, ATPB, p. 128.

<sup>3</sup>See above n. 1.

<sup>4</sup>Ernst Käsemann, Perspectives On Paul, ET Margaret Kohl (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1971), pp. 146-47. See chapter VII, "The Spirit And The Letter," pp. 138-66.

mind in 2 Cor. 3. Thus the Spirit takes on a hermeneutical function as well. This function is of course defined and directed in accordance with Paul's christology. Käsemann's description of letter-spirit is similar to Schneider's "realistic" classification.<sup>1</sup>

Schneider writes that a formalistic use implies that letter is the literal sense and spirit is the Spiritual or typological meaning. The realistic use is where νόμος equals the Mosaic law itself, not a sense of it, "lacking any internal force to give help towards its advance" which is now annuled in the Gospel and where πνεῦμα is the indwelling and actualizing presence within the believer.<sup>2</sup>

Paul's use of Ezekiel and Jeremiah in 2 Cor. 3 certainly added a new dimension to the anticipated work of the Spirit but remains within its possibilities.<sup>3</sup> Paul, however, supplies insights which were never imagined by Ezekiel or Jeremiah such as the heart of stone becoming equal to the mosaic law and the spirit becoming the manner of Christ's working in the Church.<sup>4</sup> It is obvious

---

<sup>1</sup>Bernardin Schneider, "The Meaning Of St. Paul's Antithesis 'The Letter And The Spirit'," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 15 (1953), p. 164.

<sup>2</sup>Schneider, CBQ 15:164; 207. C. H. Dodd, The Bible And The Greeks (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935), p. 37, notes that the spirit is not the content of the Law or its spiritual interpretation but is an "immanent principle of life, like the Stoic Law of Nature, but determined by the Spirit of Christ."

<sup>3</sup>Richardson, EQ 45:211. <sup>4</sup>Collange, E2C, p. 50.

from such passages as 2 Cor. 3:4, Gal. 3:24 and Ro. 2:29; 7:6 that Paul had gone beyond strictly logical and historical developments of the OT as expressed in the Messiah Jesus. Paul had also developed the "logique du mystère du Dieu, c.à.d. de la logique surnaturelle des réalités divines."<sup>1</sup> The spirit-letter matrix contributed to this.<sup>2</sup> This incorporates the spirit-letter configuration into the gospel-law tension and implies that Christ is the Spirit who both judges and justifies. The fact that Jesus was the Messiah was mediated through insights into the OT given by the living and present Spirit.

The hermeneutical role of the Spirit pervades several of the uses of the OT in 1 and 2 Cor. The discussion of wisdom in 1 Cor. 1:18-31 has prepared the way for the OT quotation of 1 Cor. 2:9 which expressly declares the hiddenness of God's plans. The quotation is immediately followed by the assertion that the Spirit had revealed those things to the Christians. Thus the new revelation in the Messiah could only be known through the interpretive medium of the Spirit. 2 Cor. 3:16 continues the discussion of the hiddenness of God's wisdom and the rebellious attitudes of the Jewish nation. The OT quota-

---

<sup>1</sup>Renard, LATP, p. 213.

<sup>2</sup>Käsemann, POP, p. 164, finds the hermeneutical key to Paul's understanding of the OT to be his belief in justification. Note also Ro. 4 and 2 Cor. 3:7ff; 10:5-13.

tions asserted that a turning to Yahweh would bring enlightenment regarding the true nature of God's wisdom as expressed in Torah. Paul's point was his freedom as an apostle and it was the Spirit (2 Cor. 3:17) that brought him freedom and enlightenment.

### Summary

The use of OT quotations in 1 and 2 Corinthians enunciates the central continuity between the OT and Corinth to be the character of God as particularly manifest in His work through the Messiah. The resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth was central to His acclamation as Messiah. The quotations emphasize both a historical and a pneumatic conceptuality. The historical conceptuality emerges from the frequent use of OT history as a moral guide for Christian piety and displays a typological, therefore historically grounded, way of thought. The pneumatic conceptuality relates to the often mentioned necessity for divine revelation through the Spirit of Messiah in order to understand God's message to the new Israel, the Church. The newness of Paul's application provides a certain discontinuity with the accepted interpretive conclusions of his Jewish contemporaries, but finds solid continuity with the historical sense of the OT.

TEXT FORMULATIONS IN THE PRE-PAULINE  
CHRISTIAN TRADITION

TESTIMONIES

Methodology

This discussion of testimonies will be limited to a presentation of the necessary methodology for testing the hypothesis in 1 and 2 Cor. Much has been written<sup>1</sup> on this subject since Hatch remarked that the Church may have adopted the Jewish practice of assembling collections of OT Scriptures.<sup>2</sup> J. R. Harris' theory that the Church's testimony collection was in Greek and in one book<sup>3</sup> has not found complete approval but his thoughts in

---

<sup>1</sup>Pierre Prigent, L'Épître De Barnabé I-XVI Et Ses Sources (Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1961), pp. 16-28, presents a survey.

<sup>2</sup>Edwin Hatch, Essays In Biblical Greek (Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1889), p. 203. Dodd, AS, p. 25, says that Harris' book was the starting point, in Britain at least, of the modern study of the use of the OT in the NT.

<sup>3</sup>J. R. Harris, Testimonies, I (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1916-20), pp. 109; 116-17. Plooiij, who supports Harris, writes, STB, pp. 26-27, that the testimony book was in Aramaic and developed very early in the Palestinian Church. This early formulation of the details and basis of Christianity leaves no room for a later development by Hellenistic Christianity. Plooiij, STB, p. 34, suggests that Jesus Himself inaugurated this testimony conceptuality.

modified form still have relevance today. There may be no a priori reason why the Church could not have had testimony literature but what is debatable is the documentation used as proof for such an assertion.<sup>1</sup> It is always possible, given the common source of the OT, that striking similarities might occur with nothing but a coincidental and irrelevant relationship.<sup>2</sup> F. C. Burkitt conjectures that Matthew made notes and proof-texts for his writing, possibly the Logia of Papias, on the basis of the agreement of Matthew's OT quotations with the MT against the LXX.<sup>3</sup>

Michel, on the basis of the lateness of the evidence for testimonies, writes that it is always questionable whether the texts had their origin in the early strata of Christianity or if one should seek their source in a later time.<sup>4</sup> He feels there is little hard evidence for the testimony hypothesis and that Paul had nothing besides the OT.<sup>5</sup> Of course Michel's objection regarding

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert A. Kraft, "Barnabas' Isaiah Test And The 'Testimony Book' Hypothesis," Journal of Biblical Literature 79 (1960), p. 339. Carl Harris Marbury, "Old Testament Textual Traditions In The New Testament: Studies In Text-Types" (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1968), p. 150, suggests that, in light of 4QTest., one give more attention to oral and floating testimonies which may antedate Qumran and Christian activities.

<sup>2</sup>Knox, SPCJ, p. 126.      <sup>3</sup>Burkitt, GHT, pp. 125-27.

<sup>4</sup>Michel, P&SB, p. 40      <sup>5</sup>Michel, P&SB, pp. 43, 54.

early testimonies may have been met by the finds in Qumran cave 4.<sup>1</sup> With reference to 4Q Test. Fitzmyer concludes that "it resembles so strongly the composite citations of the NT writers that it is difficult not to admit that Testimonia influenced certain parts of the NT."<sup>2</sup>

Paul's tendency to use composite quotations from the OT is later seen in the peculiarities of Rabbinics. This tendency of the NT writers is the primary reason for setting forth a testimony hypothesis, and the phenomenon of composite quotations finds its best examples in Paul's writings.<sup>3</sup> Paul's belief in the essential unity of the OT must also be seen as fundamental for the concept of testimony collections.

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew Black, "The Christological Use Of The Old Testament In The New Testament," New Testament Studies 18 (1971-72), p. 2. See J. M. Allegro, "Fragments Of A Qumran Scroll Of Eschatological Midrāsīm," Journal of Biblical Literature 77 (1958), p. 350 and JBL 75:182ff. Fitzmyer, ESB, pp. 83-85, questions the nature of 4Q Test. He feels more work is needed to be sure that the Pesher of Josh. 6:26 is even a testimony. He does, however, give it provisional status as a testimony of some sort. William R. Lane, "A New Commentary Structure In 4Q Florilegium," Journal of Biblical Literature 78 (1959), pp. 345-46, asserts that 4Q Flor. is a commentary, not a testimony. He finds it to be a complex pesher with 2 Sam. 7:10b-14a as the text whose commentary is supported by other biblical quotations which alone are introduced by כְּאִשְׁרֵי כְתוּב and thus stand apart from the 2 Sam. material, p. 346.

<sup>2</sup>Fitzmyer, ESB, p. 86.

<sup>3</sup>Fitzmyer, ESB, pp. 65-66. See Ro. 15:9-12, 2 Cor. 6:16-18.



A methodology for recovering the evidence of testimonies must begin by locating a composite citation. Second, one looks for possible false attributions of one text to another author. Third, one seeks any textual variants which may occur in another citation or which vary from the usual form. Fourth, and hardest to prove, when one finds an author who presents a chain of texts under a common concept and aim which is not manifest from each text individually, then one has reasonable proof of the use of a testimony.<sup>1</sup>

One common characteristic of the composite quotations is that they are all used with reference to the key-events in the NT tradition and therefore must have been intentionally used. This may be related to Dt. 19:15 and its implication that two or more witnesses (in this case Scriptural) are needed to establish a fact.<sup>2</sup> When one applies this five-point methodology to OT quotations one finds a lack of numerous composite citations that are repeated in the NT and Patristic writings.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Prigent, EBar, p. 28.

<sup>2</sup>Jiřndrich Mánek, "Composite Quotations In The New Testament And Their Purpose," Communio Viatorum 13 (1970), p. 186.

<sup>3</sup>Fitzmyer, ESB, p. 85, points out that the Isa. 28:16; Psa. 118-:22; Isa. 8:14 sequence in Mat. 21:42; Ro. 9:31; 1 Pet. 2:6-8 and Ep. Abr. 6,2,4 has so many differences that a one source theory becomes highly questionable. Kraft, JBL 79:350, concludes in his study of Barnabas that Harris' theory is too simple for the com-



### Testimonies In 1 And 2 Cor.

The first step in locating a testimony in 1 and 2 Cor. is to isolate the composite citations. Isa. 25:8 and Hosea 13:14 are combined in 1 Cor. 15:54-55 and Lev. 26:11-12, Isa. 52:11 and 2 Sam. 7:14 are combined in 2 Cor. 6:16-18. There are no false attributions of authorship present in these two groups of quotations. There are no peculiar and repeated textual variants. These two catenae are not quoted by other authors, however, which removes any firm foundation for their use as testimonies.<sup>1</sup> Though various single quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. are found in other writers, these provide no support for the testimony theory as presented by Harris. The Patristic quotations which agree with Paul have been shown to be dependent on him rather than on a third testimony-type source. What is apparent is a use of the OT more along the lines of the theses of Dodd and Lindars.

---

plexities of the citations. The possibilities remain that a complete scroll of Isaiah may have been used for some references, midrashic commentary material is also present, and that short testimony pages may have been used "each of which had its own organizational theme, yet all of which were related by means of their similar exegetical mentality." Lindars, NTA, p. 50, also sees a "common stock of exegetical material" to lie behind the writings of Peter, Paul, and the letter to the Hebrews.

<sup>1</sup>The 2 Sam. 7:14 quotation appears in Heb. 1:5.

### THE TEXT-PLOT THEORY

C. H. Dodd's theory, as presented in AS, has not gone unchallenged.<sup>1</sup> One recent and serious objection comes from Albert C. Sundberg.<sup>2</sup> In two tables<sup>3</sup> he shows the spread and concentration of the OT quotations as well as the relative importance of the OT for each NT book. Sundberg concludes that his tables do not show any "real concentration of New Testament references to particular passages of the Old Testament."<sup>4</sup> This is also the conclusion of Kraft regarding a similar study of the OT quotations in Barnabas.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Dodd's text-plots are as follows: 1) Apocalyptic-Eschatological, Joel 2-3; Zech. 9-14 (primary); Dan. 7; Mal. 3:1-6; Dan. 12 (secondary); 2) Scriptures of the New Israel, Hosea; Isa. 6:1-9:7; 11:1-10; 28:16; 40:1-11; Jer. 31:10-34 (primary); Isa. 29:9-14; Jer. 7:1-15; Hab. 1-2 (secondary); 3) Scriptures of the Servant of the Lord and the Righteous Sufferer; Isa. 42:1-44:5; 49:1-13; 50:4-11; 52:13-53:12; 61; Psa. 69; 22:31; 38; 88; 34; 118; 41; 42-43; 80 (primary); Isa. 58:6-10 (secondary); 4) Unclassified Scriptures; Psa. 8; 110; 2; Gen. 12:3; 22:18; Dt. 18:15, 19 (primary); Psa. 132; 16; 2 Sam. 7:13-14; Isa. 55:3; Amos 9:11-12 (secondary).

<sup>2</sup>Albert C. Sundberg, "On Testimonies," Novum Testamentum 3 (1959), pp. 268-81.

<sup>3</sup>Sundberg, NT 3:272-73.

<sup>4</sup>Sundberg, NT 3:271. See Robert Rendall, "Quotation In Scripture As An Index Of Wider Reference," Evangelical Quarterly 36 (1964), p. 36, for support for Dodd's theory in a study of Mat. 21.

<sup>5</sup>Kraft, JBL 79:341.

One serious weakness of Sundberg's study is that he uses the Nestle 1948 tables as the source for OT quotations and therefore lists many "citations" from not only the Thessalonian epistles but also from Revelation. The numerous allusions to the OT contained in these two books are hardly to be ranked with the explicit OT quotations upon which Dodd based his conclusions. The statistics of Sundberg's study are therefore heavily weighted with misleading data. His specific study of the six citations of Psa. 22 in the NT demonstrates, however, that the citation of the OT does not of itself automatically serve as a pointer to the larger OT context.<sup>1</sup> We have noted several quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. that had become proverbial in nature and were not used with reference to their context. They do not conflict with their original contextual sense.<sup>2</sup>

Dodd's thesis, however, primarily affirms that text-plots confirm contextuality as opposed to the atomizing influence seen in Qumran and later Rabbinics.<sup>3</sup> Paul's

---

<sup>1</sup>Sundberg, NT 3:276f. Dodd, AS, p. 126, notes that the intended sections were understood as "wholes, and particular verses or sentences were quoted from them rather as pointers to the whole context than as constituting testimonies in and for themselves. . . . But in the fundamental passages it is the total context that is in view, and is the basis of the argument."

<sup>2</sup>1 Cor. 1:31; 2:9b; 15:32; 2 Cor. 7:6; 8:21; 9:7; 10:17.

<sup>3</sup>Dodd, AS, pp. 107f.

use of the OT in 1 and 2 Cor. confirms this. Paul did not ransack the OT for proof-texts but rather worked within a consistent framework of context.

One has an almost innate sense that context should play a leading role in the interpretation and, especially, application of any given passage. One also feels that to ignore or to give no indication of being aware of context is a sign of an inaccurate, if not tendentious, exegesis. It is this sense of contextual morality that has given rise to an article like that of S. L. Edgar which pushes for a direct relation between the Dominical historicity of a saying in proportion to its contextual fidelity. Edgar's thesis is that Jesus was more conscious of context than later gospel writers, therefore, those uses of the OT ascribed to Jesus which are observing of OT context are closest to His actual words.<sup>1</sup> Richard Mead replies that one should not use modern methods of exegesis to make requirements upon the Bible. The evidence that respect for context is apparent "as a function of only certain kinds of O.T. uses suggests quite plainly that historical contextuality was not

---

<sup>1</sup>S. L. Edgar, "Respect For Context In Quotations From The Old Testament," New Testament Studies 9 (1962-63), pp. 55-62. Barnabas Lindars, New Testament Apologetic (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961), p. 17, observes that generally NT quotations have some regard for context. Dodd, AS, p. 130, would agree and calls whatever shift of meaning does occur "an expansion of the original scope of the passage."

cherished on principle in New Testament times."<sup>1</sup> Working within the limits of the Gospels, high respect for context is found in passages where there is either a text being commented upon, "a solid basis for valid inferences," or in a situation of argument or attack by hostile questioners.<sup>2</sup> This means that respect for context was directly related to the function which the passage served the NT writer.

Mead finds that this high regard for contextuality is especially notable in situations where an inner circle's thoughts are challenged. Most frequently, the inner circle may "think that certain assumptions and forms of demonstration stand beyond question."<sup>3</sup> However, Paul, in 1 and 2 Cor., does not evidence such an unrestrained proof-texting. Dodd's method is to ask if the NT quotation was an "organic outgrowth" of the OT or just an "arbitrary reading into a passage of a meaning essentially foreign to it."<sup>4</sup> At Corinth there was certainly

---

<sup>1</sup>Richard T. Mead, "A Dissenting Opinion About Respect For Context In Old Testament Quotations," New Testament Studies 10 (1963-64), p. 288.

<sup>2</sup>Mead, NTS 10:287. Irenaeus, who primarily quoted to meet the arguments of his opponents, tended to quote exactly or nearly so and is almost wholly free from loose paraphrase; Swete, IOTG, p. 414.

<sup>3</sup>Mead, NTS 10:289, concludes: "In general, therefore, we should expect unrestrained proof-texting to flourish in groups marked by strong inner consensus shielded with an impenetrable parochialism."

<sup>4</sup>Dodd, AS, p. 133.

an inner circle of believers as well as opponents who challenged Paul.

Besides the influence of the addressees of the letter on the context, Paul's literary form also had its effect. The pesher material of Qumran provides an example of atomization of an OT text which results in a disregard for its context and conventional readings. This is also a possible result from midrashic literature.<sup>1</sup> But, as a whole, Paul's use of the OT is more conservative than later exegesis at the end of the first century.<sup>2</sup> Perhaps James Barr has best pointed the way by stating that one should not use modern contextual guidelines but see the OT quotations "against the context of what the early Christians were doing with them."<sup>3</sup> It may be asserted, contrary to Barr, that in 1 and 2 Cor. Paul displays evidence of a contextual awareness and fidelity.

---

<sup>1</sup>Lou H. Silberman, "Unriddling The Riddle," Revue De Qumran 3 (1961-62), p. 332. Wilfred L. Knox, St. Paul And The Church Of Jerusalem (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1925), passim, maintains that Paul shows the same disregard for the original meaning and context as did his contemporaries.

<sup>2</sup>Herbert Braun, "Das Alte Testament In Neuen Testament," Zeitschrift Für Theologie Und Kirche 59 (1962), p. 21, writes that the OT was basically used in the NT "in der Konkretion seiner Situation."

<sup>3</sup>James Barr, Old And New In Interpretation (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1966), p. 142. This is spoken against the theory of C. H. Dodd. <sup>3</sup>

This has been demonstrated in Part Two. The conclusion to be drawn from this is that the OT context itself was the formative factor in the selection of the specific verse to be quoted. This is not to deny that several of Paul's quotations may show signs of previous compilation but rather to assert that Paul, and whatever aspects of tradition he adopted, allowed himself to be guided by the OT context. His soteriology did not run rampant over the historical particulars of the OT.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, Dodd's concept of a basic set of OT contexts which exercised a control over the NT utilization of specific texts is supported.

#### Text-Plots In 1 And 2 Cor.

Paul did not use any of the passages in Dodd's first group. This is understandable because when, in 1 Cor. 15, Paul spoke of the future it concerned the event of resurrection, which finds no explicit OT support.

From Dodd's second group, Paul has used Hos. 3:14 (1 Cor. 15:55) to refer to the ultimate absence of death. Hos. 10:12 (2 Cor. 9:10) is used to speak of God's gracious provisions for man. Isa. 29:14 (1 Cor. 1:19)

---

<sup>1</sup>This is a point of continuing controversy. For example, Doeve, JHSG, p. 29, and Stendahl, SSM, pp. 190ff., see no difference between NT and later Rabbinic exegesis while William H. Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation Among The Sectaries Of The Dead Sea Scrolls," The Biblical Archaeologist 14 (1951), pp. 60-62, 73, sees a wide gulf separating the two. Marbury, OTTT, p. 161, says that Paul's use of the OT is essentially not rabbinic at all.



illustrated the hidden quality of God's mind from men.

The Servant of the Lord Scriptures in 1 and 2 Cor. are Isa. 49:8 (2 Cor. 6:2) and Isa. 49:13 (2 Cor. 7:6) and speak of the salvation and comfort of God. This was particularly fitting for Paul's context of concern for the Corinthians as well as Titus. However, there is no use of these passages with reference to the Servant of the Lord.

The fourth grouping of Dodd's text-plots is the unclassified corpus. Paul's use of Psa. 8:6 (1 Cor. 15:27) and Psa. 110:1 (1 Cor. 15:25) could easily be classified under group three in that they refer to the kingdom of the Anointed One.

A brief comparison of 1 and 2 Cor. with Romans shows that in Romans Paul's OT quotations are limited to Dodd's groups two and three, the New Israel and Servant of the Lord. Also, in Romans Paul's OT is presented in a more formal manner and more to the point and essential purpose of each text-plot. In 1 and 2 Cor. the OT passages do not always relate to the thrust of the text-plot even though the verses are part of the group. Therefore Paul has used the OT differently in 1 and 2 Cor. than in Romans. Romans shows a use of formal evidence while 1 and 2 Cor. shows a situational application. This is due to the different life settings of the two correspondences rather than to a different attitude to the OT by the



apostle. In Romans and 1 and 2 Cor. Paul used the OT as the voice of Yahweh and His Messiah.

While the text-plot theory with its contextual argument provides an essential and accurate understanding of the coherent use of the OT in early Christianity, it does not account for the use of every Scripture within the plots. Behind the original and progressive accumulation of OT texts used by Paul stands the formative conceptuality that God was actively working in the Church. This gave Scripture the potential to make a contribution to all areas of life, not simply to four general topics.

INDICATIONS OF A PALESTINIAN GREEK OT

IN 1 AND 2 COR.

With the textual and conceptual perimeters previously defined, can one now expect to find some indications of the earliest strata of the Old Greek (proto-Lucian or -Theodotion) in the OT quotations in 1 and 2 Cor.? Such readings are, at best, difficult to discern. Many readings previously thought to be proto-Lucian must now be seen as the Old Greek (OG) stratum of Lucianic tradition in  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$ .<sup>1</sup> Also, a reading which does not agree with the MT or B has little relevance for discerning proto-Lucianic readings in the later prophets and hagiographa. Following Barthélemy's scheme, the Palestinian Hebrew-based OG underlies the  $\kappa\alpha\iota\gamma\epsilon$  revisions to the Babylonian Hebrew, but readings which do not equal MT B are still of questionable value with reference to Lucianic readings in the major prophets.

The vast majority of research in the KAIGE recension (KR) and proto-Lucian has been done in Reigns. In those books it is becoming increasingly more convincing when a particular text-type is delineated. In the Pentateuch, Psalms and Major Prophets, however, one is

---

<sup>1</sup>Frank Moore Cross, Jr., "The Evolution Of A Theory Of Local Texts," Septuagint And Cognate Studies, Number Two, ed. Robert A. Kraft, 1972 Proceedings IOSCS, pp. 116-17.

hard pressed to define with certainty KR or proto-Lucian and yet the majority of the quotations in 1 and 2 Cor., as in the rest of the NT, fall within these books. The work of the GLXX has clarified the textual families reflected in the MS evidence but comprehensive works dealing with the translational tendencies of each book are not yet available. With these limitations in mind this study will seek to discern any indication of the use of a Greek OT which has affinities with the types generally assigned to a text-type which early on developed a reading characteristic of the Palestinian locale. Whether such readings follow the characteristics of KR or proto-Lucian may not be clearly answered at this time. In spite of these present methodological limitations some insight can be gained.

#### Textual Affinities According To The Old Testament Books

Isaiah. In the quotation of Isa. 22:13 (1 Cor. 15:32) there are no GLXX nor BHS variants and Paul reproduced the LXX exactly. This phrase had evidently acquired the status of a proverb and therefore passed into all known traditions in the same Hebrew and then Greek form. The quotation of Isa. 25:8 (1 Cor. 15:54) has long been recognized as having affinity with Theodotion. Within the framework of Cross and Barthélemy's work there is indication of a proto-Theodotionic reading; that is to say, that Paul shows the pre-Hexaplaric OG at this point.

The Hebrew tradition presents a virtually united presentation of the Pi'ēl reading of  $\gamma\lambda\lambda$ . This is reflected in the LXX κατέπλεν. Another tradition translated  $\gamma\lambda\lambda$  as a Pu'āl. This is seen in the Syriac (wntbl'), the Theodotionic reading from Q and 1 Cor. 15: 54. There is no indication that the versions have been harmonized with Paul at this point, therefore Paul reflects an early first century version. This is further strengthened by the reading εἰς νῆκος. Θ' α' and the Syh have this reading. If chronological priority is given to the Θ' form it appears that it was later taken up by Paul and used by α' and the Syh. σ' substituted the more common and idiomatic εἰς τέλος.

John Grindel<sup>1</sup> has shown that the translation pattern  $\eta\chi\lambda\lambda/\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \nu\eta\kappa\omicron\varsigma$  is a characteristic of the KR. In LXX<sup>Isa</sup>  $\eta\chi\lambda\lambda$  is normally translated as εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα<sup>2</sup> but may also be translated in other ways though none of them is εἰς νῆκος.<sup>3</sup> Thus there is a degree of freedom in how the phrase is translated in Isaiah and also in Jeremiah.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>John A. Grindel, "Another Characteristic Of The KAIGE Recension:  $\eta\chi\lambda\lambda/\nu\eta\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ ," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 31 (1969), p. 500. See also his "Matthew 12, 18-21," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 29 (1967), pp. 110-15.

<sup>2</sup>Isa. 13:20; 28:28; 33:20.

<sup>3</sup>Isa. 25:8, ἰσχυεῖν; 57:16, διὰ πάντος; 34:10, εἰς χρόνον πόλυν.

<sup>4</sup>Grindel, CBQ 31:500.

This contrasts with Job and Psalms where it virtually always translates as εἰς τέλος.<sup>1</sup> Grindel calls the 1 Cor. 15:54 passage a quotation from KR.<sup>2</sup> He has also established the dependence of α' on KR for εἰς νῦν.<sup>3</sup>

Because this is an early first-century reading which does not agree with the MT (in a book <sup>h</sup>where a proto-MT basis is present) nor with the OG tradition, it can be attributed to an early Palestinian textual tradition; though it may be better to say 'translational' tradition due to the fact that no Hebrew non-MT basis is indicated. E. Ellis<sup>3</sup> says that a rendering in 1 Cor. 15:45 of εἰς νῦν represents a "moot point" as to whether Paul found the phrase in his text or whether his text influenced the versions of θ' and α' and concludes that the rendering is probably a creation of the early church's doctrinal and liturgical formulations. The present evidence shows that this text was part of his Greek OT and that he was faithful to his version.

In Isa. 28:11-12 (1 Cor. 14:21) a Syriac reading indicates a possible Hebrew basis for Paul's use of λαλήσω which differs from the LXX and the MT. The underlying

---

<sup>1</sup>Except Psa. 49:20, αἰῶνος; Grindel, CBQ 31:500.

<sup>2</sup>Grindel, CBQ 31:501, n. 11. See also Jer. 50:39 (27:39 LXX), Lam. 5:20; Psa. 49:10; Job 36:7.

<sup>3</sup>Ellis, PUOT, pp. 194-95.

Hebrew of Paul's version appears to have read  $\text{ללח}$  (as does the Syriac). This section of the quotation ( $\text{λαλήσω τῷ λαῷ τοῦτῳ}$ ) is in conformity with a text-type and is not an ad hoc Pauline adaptation. This is further strengthened by the reading of Aquila. A Theodotonic reading is not extant at this point. However, giving weight to the early first century reading of Paul indicates that Aquila may have adopted the tradition which Paul reflects. This appears to have been the case in Aquila's reading of Isa. 25:8. In passing we may be reminded that the λέγει κύριος sayings of Paul seem to indicate a pre-Pauline early<sup>(A.D. 30-50)</sup> Christian form which reflect text-forms sometimes agreeing with the LXX and other times showing affinities with  $\alpha'$  or  $\theta'$ . Therefore more weight should be given to the concept that 1 Cor. 14:21 is not a Pauline ad hoc formulation.

In Isa. 29:14 (1 Cor. 1:19) Paul follows A Q  $\kappa$  B against the Lucianic groups and V by not including the double use of  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$  (V  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon$ ). Paul's version preceded this Lucianic correction to the OG. His only variant from the OG tradition, the use of  $\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega$  for  $\kappa\rho\upsilon\psi\omega$ , gives <sup>convincing</sup> no evidence for an early Palestinian text-type. The reading of  $\kappa\rho\upsilon\psi\omega$  by Justin gives probability to the occurrence of an ad hoc (either from a memory slip or a purposeful alteration) substitution of  $\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega$  by Paul.

The use of Isa. 40:13 (1 Cor. 2:16) is, for all practical purposes, an exact representation of the OG.

Paul's word order (taken from Ro. 11:34 σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ) shows his version varied from  $\aleph$  B V and the major Lucianic and Catena witnesses. Paul shows negligible affinity with  $\alpha'$  (who reads the more fitting to Paul's context, πνεῦμα) and  $\Theta'$ . The dialectic distinction shown in the Pauline use of συμβιβάσει for συμβιβᾷ shows the presence of the reading to be distinguished from Q and B, with Q as an especially pure representative of the OG, which read -βᾷ while Q<sup>mg</sup> reads -βάσει with  $\aleph^a$  A V and most Lucianic witnesses. Given the priority chronologically of Paul's reading, this is a possible early stratum of Lucian's text.

Isa. 45:14 (1 Cor. 14:25) and 49:13 (2 Cor. 7:6) are allusive and offer no basis for the present consideration. Isa. 64:4 (1 Cor. 2:9) is quoted so freely that it also has no clear affinities with any known text group. Isa. 49:8 (2 Cor. 6:2) has only one minor variant in the quoted portion in GLXX and Paul agrees with the OG exactly.

In Isa. 52:11 (2 Cor. 6:17) Paul's agreement with A B regarding ἐξέλθατε against V Q<sup>C</sup> and most of the Lucianic witnesses shows the influence of the OG while the ἀφήσθε reading for ἄπτεσθε of B V 88 clearly shows later Hexaplaric influence. The second important variant in the Isa. 52:11 quotation, Paul's use of αὐτῶν for LXX αὐτῆς, shows that this is an early reading in the Lucianic

strata of witnesses. The underlying Hebrew may have read a feminine plural whereas the MT reads singular as does the LXX. Or this may be a translational preference of the version Paul used. In Isa. 55:10 (2 Cor. 9:10) the GLXX presents only minor variants and Paul quoted the Greek OT exactly (ἐπιχωρήγων is not considered to be part of the quotation).

For the book of Isaiah, therefore, Paul reproduces the OG tradition in the main. There are several readings, however, which diverge both from the OG and MT traditions. One may conclude that this represents a conformity to another text-type which would have been current in Palestine and Syria while Paul was being educated. Due to the present state of MSS evidence and methodology for determining the text-types of LXX MSS one cannot be dogmatic regarding the implications of this tendency. This does not appear to be evidence for a thorough-going Palestinian Hebrew Vorlage but is more likely a Greek OT text revision dependent on a translational preference. The point is that Paul's Isaiah quotations show some evidence of a text-type other than the Alexandrian and MT traditions.

Hosea. In the Hos. 13:14 quotation (1 Cor. 15:55) there was a great fluidity in the early forms as shown by the reading for the LXX δίκη, which Paul renders νίκος: Aquila reads ῥήματα; Symmachus πλήγη; Theodotion δίκη.



Paul followed the OG text. The Three read  $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ ,  $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ , and  $\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$  respectively as a targumic addition to the LXX  $\pi\omicron\upsilon$ . Paul's text had avoided (preceded?) the Theodotionic influence at this point though his text also differs from the LXX in word order. In reading  $\nu\tilde{\iota}\mu\omicron\varsigma$  Paul finds no other MSS support. Only one Lucianic witness and three catena MSS and a few others read  $\nu\tilde{\iota}\eta$ .  $\Nu\tilde{\iota}\mu\omicron\varsigma$  is a later form of  $\nu\tilde{\iota}\eta$  from around the first century B.C. Both words may translate  $\text{נָּלַךְ}$  in the Greek OT but never  $\text{נָּלַךְ}$ .

It is interesting that the <sup>LXX</sup> MSS do not preserve the later Greek form  $\nu\tilde{\iota}\mu\omicron\varsigma$  and this shows that they have not been harmonized to Paul. Paul either updated the form of his Greek OT, substituted the  $\nu\tilde{\iota}\mu\omicron\varsigma$  from the preceding Isa. quotation or found the text-form as <sup>it</sup> is in its testimony-like form. Especially noteworthy is the fact that 22<sup>C</sup> reads  $\nu\tilde{\iota}\eta$ . This is a later correction to an important Lucianic witness which originally read  $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\eta\kappa\eta$  with the major Lucianic group. Against what was 22 corrected? The rather allusive use of Hos. 10:12 (2 Cor. 9:10) shows Paul following a text word order that agrees with the OG tradition against a majority of Lucianic witnesses. But the pronoun  $\omicron\mu\tilde{\omega}\nu$  (LXX  $\omicron\mu\tilde{\iota}\nu$ ) shows the translation of  $\text{ל}$  by a genitive rather than a dative, though MSS evidence (106 Aeth) is slight for  $\omicron\mu\tilde{\omega}\nu$  in the Greek OT.

Ezekiel 37:27 (2 Cor. 6:16). Here again, in this possible source for Paul's quotation, is seen the use of ׀ being translated by the genitive case only in the Lucianic versions whereas the majority of the others take the dative case. The MT reads ׀׀׀, the LXX αὐτοῖς and Paul reads αὐτῶν. This may be a translational preference of proto-Lucian (or the OG, Tov). Paul's word order ἔσονται μου displays the early reading which V Q and the majority of Lucianic witnesses support against B. B also shows a genitival reading for ׀׀ in this case. Ezek. 37:16 and 38:7 show that the Lucianic groups alone display this genitival tendency, although this is not a completely consistent phenomenon as is evidenced by the ׀׀ = ׀׀ in Lucian of Ezek. 37:18.

Proverbs. Paul's quotation of Prov. 3:41 (2 Cor. 8:21) agrees with the OG after account is taken of the effect of Paul's hermeneutics in the text-form (hermeneutical retroversion) and there are no MT or SLXX variants. While there are no variants for the Prov. 22:9 quotation (2 Cor. 9:7) the allusive quality of the text offers no evidence for a particular form.

Job. The single Job quotation, 5:13 (1 Cor. 3:19) varies from all known text-forms except for one agreement (αὐτῶν) with A.

Psalms. All the Psalm passages quoted by Paul in 1 and 2 Cor. have no GLXX variants and agree with the OG

exactly, except for one (1 Cor. 15:27) which agrees after hermeneutical retroversion and 1 Cor. 15:25, which is a close adaptation. This agreement among the Greek MSS is striking in contrast with the fluidity of traditions seen in the Isaiah quotations.

2 Samuel. The single 2 Sam. quotation has only one minor GLXX variant and Paul agrees with the OG after hermeneutical retroversion.

Pentateuchal Quotations. Paul's quotations from Genesis, after retroversion, agree with the LXX exactly. The Ex. 32:6 quotation (1 Cor. 10:7) has only one variant and that is in Justin. Paul quotes exactly. Ex. 34:34 is an allusion. Ex. 16:18 (2 Cor. 8:15) shows a mixed tradition. Paul's word order finds witness in n (a possible Lucianic witness) Arm. and Boh. while his ὀλίγον is witnessed by A and Symmachus.

The Nu. 14:16 (1 Cor. 10:5) quotation has only one LXX variant and Paul quoted exactly.

The first two Dt. quotations, 22:24 and 25:4, (1 Cor. 5:13, 9:9) after hermeneutical retroversion agree with the OG tradition. Dt. 32:17 is used allusively. Dt. 19:15 (2 Cor. 13:1) shows signs of Pauline adaptation and is witnessed by various MSS such as 72 314 19 108 and others which are not at present clearly classified according to text-form, one exception being n (75) which has Lucianic readings. However, major Uncials attest Paul's

reading of σταθήσεται (A F M V W and others). The passive (στάθη) is also found in Mt. 18:16, and may witness to an early Palestinian Hebrew reading in Pu'al. Mt. 18:16 is a pure f reading. The general cast of this passive reading in the NT is one different from the Alexandrian trend and differs from the MT as well.

### Conclusions

What is striking about the Pentateuchal quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. is their very close fidelity to the OG tradition. The Pentateuchal quotations adhere to what appears to be a pervasive and ancient Greek tradition while the Isaiah quotations show an early Palestinian influence away from B and MT. The Psalm quotations also clearly show a unified tradition and do not appear to be affected by local text-forms. The proto-Lucianic revisions to the Pentateuch appear to play no part in 1 and 2 Cor. Cross and Barthélemy stress that this revision was a process and sporadic in its effect. In considering Paul's chronological relationship with the Lucianic and other variants Paul's particular text-forms either precede the proto-Lucianic revisions or, following Tov's multiple OG theory, represent one of two (or more?) OG forms.

One might, at first blush, hold that Paul was closer to the OG in the Pentateuch and Psalms because he knew them the best. While this may be true, the Greek OT

MSS themselves show that the OT pericopae Paul used were more consistently transmitted than those derived from other parts of the LXX. It would appear from the quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. that the Pentateuch and Psalms were known to Paul in a tradition closely aligned with the Egyptian (Cross) or Antiochian (Barthélemy) but that the prophetic books circulated in text-forms based on foundations differing from the Egyptian. There is no clear indication that the quotations in 1 and 2 Cor. show the effects of a non-MT Vorlage though KR-type readings are present. Cross writes that the formula Lucian  $\neq$  B, MT only applies in the Pentateuch and former prophets because an Egyptian Hebrew text underlies B and the MT is assigned to Babylon, leaving all other readings dependent on a Palestinian Hebrew basis, differing from the MT. For the major and minor prophets, Cross asserts that the Hebrew under B is Palestinian. If, with Barthélemy, one gives up the idea of an Egyptian Hebrew basis for B and says that the Palestinian Hebrew is the basis of B, then Lucianic readings are difficult to distinguish from B itself and anything that differs from the MT could be a Palestinian reading. While differences may have arisen in the Hebrew in Egypt from its Palestinian parent text, these do not appear in Paul's 1 and 2 Cor. quotations.

As has been said earlier, a first century control, such as Qumran, is needed and helpful for a study such as

this. In the books where little has been done to isolate early Palestinian readings, the quotations of 1 and 2 Cor. can act as such a control in the absence of Qumran evidence. Such has been done in this study and the evidence illuminates early variants in first century Palestine from the Greek OT tradition (LXX) but also emphasizes the relative purity with which the Pentateuch and Psalms existed in Paul's day.

This study has shown that the OT was used by Paul for more than just polemic against the Jews (Harnack) but also formed the basis for the guidance of Christian piety and morality. Braun's arguments for complete discontinuity between the Testaments is not supported from the evidence in the Corinthian correspondence. These letters show use of the OT based on two factors, the second being an organic extension of the first. The first is a continuity of deity and the second is a promise-fulfillment schema. The latter presupposes the former and cannot exist without it. Thus the works that stress the salvation-historical relationship between the Testaments (Michel, Dodd, Goppelt, Dietzfelbinger) find support in 1 and 2 Cor. A strictly apologetic origin of Paul's use of the OT, such as Lindars presents, is therefore inadequate at this point.

Ulonska's three questions<sup>1</sup> may now be answered as

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. p. 79 above.

far as 1 and 2 Cor. are concerned. Paul did in fact treat his hearers as acquainted with OT. This is apparent from his IF alone, not to mention Paul's frequent examples from Israel's wilderness wanderings. Paul could not have been with the Corinthians for long before he would have fully explained his gospel "according to the Scriptures." This course of study alone would provide an acquaintance with the OT sufficient to appreciate Paul's quotations, not to mention the undoubted influence of the Synagogue community from which many converts came.

Ulonka's second question was whether Paul used a salvation-historical schema. It has already been sufficiently demonstrated that Paul did use such a conceptuality. Ulonka's aversion to this fact stems from his emphasis on the newness of Paul's religion to the exclusion of linkage with OT piety. Ulonka is convinced that Paul's near expectation of the Parousia made any need for historical structure redundant.<sup>1</sup>

Therefore Ulonka answers his third question concerning Paul's obligations to his OT materials in the negative: Paul only used the OT for illustration, not for authority. This view is an echo of Harnack's observations. The position need not be either/or but rather both/and.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ulonka, FAZA, pp. 207-08, speaks of Paul's lostness in the Lord. See Graydon F. Snyder, "Sayings on the Delay of the End," Biblical Research 20 (1975), pp. 19-35, for a recent survey of this subject.

Ulonka's overemphasis of the illustrative function of the quotations has overlooked, first of all, the significance of the IF within the context of Judaism and, secondly, the overt connection of the God of the OT both with the OT events and with their contemporary significance. The OT was more than contemplative material and did in fact transmit elements of piety.

In conclusion, this study has shown that in 1 and 2 Cor. Paul has used the OT in close connection with its historical context. In doing so the Apostle showed no evidence of picking and choosing among text-types to find a suitable reading for his theology but, on the contrary, faithfully used the Greek OT text at hand. His sometimes quite free adaptations do not destroy the the essential historical sense of the passages but rather illuminate their meaning by the light of Paul's messianic beliefs. For these beliefs to be supported without warping or denying the OT context and without fabrication of the OT text is to primarily discover just what one would expect from the direction and essence of Paul's arguments: that the work of Yahweh in the Messiah Jesus formed a continuous and logical outgrowth of His character and acts in OT history.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### BOOKS

*Aland, Kurt. Kurzgefasste Liste Der Griechischen Handschriften Des Neuen Testaments, Berlin: Walter De Gruyter & Co., 1963.*

- 2 Cor.     Allo, E.-B. Seconde Épître Aux Corinthiens.  
Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1956.
- ATE        Amsler, Samuel. L'Ancien Testament Dans L'Église. Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1960.
- TAT        ————. La Typologie De L'Ancien Testament Chez Saint Paul. Lausanne: Imprimerie La Concorde, 1949.
- A&G        Arndt, William F. and F. Wilbur Gingrich. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- TTOB       Baker, D. L. Two Testaments, One Bible. London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1976.
- ONI        Barr, James. Old and New in Interpretation. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1966.
- 1 Cor.     Barrett, C. K. A Commentary On The First Epistle To The Corinthians. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1968.
- 2 Cor.     ————. A Commentary On The Second Epistle To The Corinthians. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1973.
- CHB I     ————. "The Interpretation Of The Old Testament In The New." In The Cambridge History Of The Bible, Vol. 1, pp. 377-411. Edited by P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1970.
- DA        Barthélemy, Dominique. Les Devanciers D'Aquila. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963.

- IOSCS Barthelemy, Dominique. "A Reexamination Of The Textual Problems In 2 Sam. 11:2-1 Kings 2:11 In The Light Of Certain Criticisms Of Les Devanciers D'Aquila." In Septuagint And Cognate Studies, Number Two, pp. 16-89. Edited by Robert A. Kraft. 1972 Proceedings IOSCS.
- TDNT Behm, J. "νοέω." In Theological Dictionary Of The New Testament, Vol. 4, pp. 948-1022. Edited by Gerhard Kittel; ET and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1967.
- TO Berliner, A. Targum Onkelos. Berlin: Gorzelanczyk & Co., 1884.
- TDNT Bertram, Georg. "στρέφω." In Theological Dictionary Of The New Testament, Vol. 7, pp. 774-829. Edited by Gerhard Kittel; ET and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1971.
- SCO Black, Matthew. The Scrolls And Christian Origins. London: Thomas Nelson And Sons Ltd., 1961.
- GNT Blass, Friedrich, and A. Debrunner. A Greek Grammar Of The New Testament And Other Early Christian Literature. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1961.
- ACNT Böhl, Eduard. Die Alttestamentlichen Zitate Im Neuen Testament. Wien: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1878.
- EREP Bonsirven, Joseph. Exégèse Rabbinique et Exégèse Paulinienne. Paris: Beauchesne Et Ses Fils, 1939.
- ECE Bornkamm, Günther. Early Christian Experience. ET Paul L. Hammer. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1969.
- SLC ————. "The History Of The Origin Of The So-Called Second Letter To The Corinthians." In The Authorship And Integrity Of The New Testament, pp. 73-81. London: S. P. C. K., 1965.

- SPCIC Bourke, Myles M. "The Eucharist And Wisdom In First Corinthians." Analecta Biblica 17-18 SPCIC Vol. 1, pp. 387-81. Rome: E Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1963.
- AUC Brandenburger, Egon. Adam Und Christus. Netherlands: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962.
- OTQ Bratcher, Robert G., ed. Old Testament Quotations In The New Testament. London: United Bible Societies, 1967.
- MP Braude, William G. The Midrash On Psalms. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.
- QNT Braun, Herbert. Qumran Und Das Neue Testament. 2 Vols. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1966.
- C&J Bring, Ragnar. Christus Und Das Gesetz. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969.
- T&U Brock, S. P. "Lucian Redivivus. Some Reflections On Barthélemy's Les Devanciers D'Aquila." Studia Evangelica, Vol. 5, pp. 176-81. Edited by F. L. Cross. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968. Texte Und Untersuchungen 103.
- B-M Brooke, Alan England and Norman McLean. The Old Testament In Greek. 3 Vols. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1906-1940.
- BDB Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs. A Hebrew And English Lexicon Of The Old Testament. Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1968.
- MQB Brownlee, William Hugh. The Meaning Of The Qumran Scrolls For The Bible. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- BEQT Bruce, F. F. Biblical Exegesis In The Qumran Texts. London: The Tyndale Press, 1960.
- 1&2Cor. ———. 1 And 2 Corinthians. London: Oliphants, 1971.
- Heb. Buchanan, George Wesley. To The Hebrews. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1972.

- TDNT      Büchsel, Friedrich. "ἀλληγορέω." In Theological Dictionary Of The New Testament, Vol. 1, pp. 260-64. Edited by Gerhard Kittel; ET and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964.
- TDNT      Bultmann, Rudolf. "καυχάομαι." In Theological Dictionary Of The New Testament, Vol. 3, pp. 645-54. Edited by Gerhard Kittel; ET and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965.
- 2Kor      ———. Der Zweite Brief An Die Korinther. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.
- GHT      Burkitt, F. Crawford. The Gospel History And Its Transmission. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906.
- AOFG      Burney, C. F. The Aramaic Origin Of The Fourth Gospel. Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1922.
- DSS      Burrows, Millar. The Dead Sea Scrolls Of St. Mark's Monastery. Vol. 1. New Haven: The American Schools Of Oriental Research, 1950.
- LAD      Cavallin, Hans Clemens Caesarius. Life After Death. Part 1: An Enquiry Into The Jewish Background. Lund: C W K Gleerup, 1974.
- CTP      Cerfaux, Lucien. Christ In The Theology Of St. Paul. ET Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker. New York: Herder And Herder, 1959.
- EAT      ———. "L'Exégèse De L'Ancien Testament Par Le Nouveau Testament." In Recueil Lucien Cerfaux. 2 vols. Gembloux: Editions J. Duculot, 1954. Vol. 2, pp. 205-17.

- KCP Cerfaux, Lucien. "'Kyrios' Dans Les Citations Paulinennes De L'Ancien Testament." In Recueil Lucien Cerfaux. 2 vols. Gembloux: Editions J. Duculot, 1954. Vol. 1, pp. 173-88.
- TTPG Charles, R. H. The Greek Versions Of The Testaments Of The Twelve Patriarchs. Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1908.
- TTP ———. The Testaments Of The Twelve Patriarchs. London: Adam And Charles Black, 1908.
- Ex. Childs, Brevard S. Exodus. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1974.
- TJ Churgin, Pinkhos. Targum Jonathan To The Prophets. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1907.
- GAT Clemen, August. Der Gebrauch Des Alten Testaments In Den Neutestamentlichen Schriften. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1895.
- E2Cor Collange, J.-F. Énigmes De La Deuxième Épître De Paul Aux Corinthiens. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1972.
- Philo Colson, F. H. and G. H. Whitaker. Philo. 10 vols. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1929-1962.
- 1 Kor Conzelmann, Hans. Der Erste Brief An Die Korinther. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.
- 1 Cor ———. 1 Corinthians. ET James W. Leitch. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- HDT Coppens, Joseph. Les Harmonies Des Deux Testaments. Tournai-Paris: Casterman, 1949.
- ALQ Cross, Frank Moore Jr. The Ancient Library Of Qumran. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1958.
- QHBT ———. "The Contribution Of The Qumran Discoveries To The Study Of The Biblical Text." In Qumran And The History Of The Biblical Text, pp. 278-92. Edited by Frank Moore Cross. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.

- IOSCS Cross, Frank Moore Jr. "The Evolution Of A Theory Of Local Texts." In Septuagint And Cognate Studies, Number Two, pp. 108-26. Edited by Robert A. Kraft. 1972 Proceedings IOSCS.
- QHBT \_\_\_\_\_ and Shemaryahu Talmon, editors. Qumran And The History Of The Biblical Text. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- CPE Cullmann, Oscar. "The Connection Of Primal Events And End Events With The New Testament Redemptive History." In The Old Testament And Christian Faith. Edited by Bernhard W. Anderson. London: ACM Press Ltd., 1964.
- TDNT \_\_\_\_\_ . "πέτρα." In Theological Dictionary Of The New Testament, Vol. 6, pp. 95-99. Edited by Gerhard Kittel; ET and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965.
- Dt. Cunliffe-Jones, H. Deuteronomy. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1951.
- Psa. Dahood, Mitchell. Psalms III. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1970.
- Mish. Danby, Herbert. The Mishnah. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972. From corrected sheets of the 1933 edition.
- COJ Davies, W. D. Christian Origins And Judaism. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1962.
- PRJ \_\_\_\_\_ . Paul And Rabbinic Judaism. London: S. P. C. K., 1962.
- TMA \_\_\_\_\_ . Torah In The Messianic Age And/Or The Age To Come. Philadelphia: Society Of Biblical Literature, 1952.
- BS Deissmann, G. Adolf. Bible Studies. ET Alexander Grieve. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901.

- Bib. Delling, Gerhard, ed. in connection with Malwine Maser. Bibliographie Zur Jüdisch-Hellenistischen Und Intertestamentarischen Literature 1900-1970. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1975. Texte Und Untersuchungen 106<sup>2</sup>.
- IWPH Dey, Lala Kalyan Kumar. The Intermediary World And Patterns Of Perfection In Philo And Hebrews. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975.
- PAT Dietzfelbinger, Christian. "Paulus Und Das Alte Testament." In Theologische Existenz Heute, pp. 1-40. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1961.
- VTN Dittmar, W. Vetus Testamentum In Novo. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1899.
- AS Dodd, C. H. According To The Scriptures. London: Nisbet & Co., Ltd., 1952.
- B&G ———. The Bible And The Greeks. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935.
- JHSG Doeve, J. W. Jewish Hermeneutics In The Synoptic Gospels And Acts. Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp., N.V., 1954.
- Dt. Driver, S. R. A Critical And Exegetical Commentary On Deuteronomy. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895.
- PS Drusius, Johannis. TA IEPA ΠΑΡΑΛΛΗΛΑ. Franekeræ: Exædebat Aegidius Radaeus, 1588.
- Gno. Dupont, Dom Jacques. Gnosis. Louvain: E. Nauwelaerts, 1960.
- EWQ Dupont-Sommer, A. The Essene Writings From Qumran. ET G. Vermes. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961.
- MB Ellis, E. Earle. "Midrashic Features In The Speeches Of Acts." In Mélanges Bibliques, pp. 303-12. Edited by Albert Descamps and André de Halleux. Belgium: J. Duculot, 1970.



- NS Ellis, E. Earle. "Midrash, Targum And New Testament Quotations." In Neotestamentica Et Semitica, pp. 61-69. Edited by E. Earle Ellis and Max Wilcox. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969.
- PUOT \_\_\_\_\_ . Paul's Use of the Old Testament. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.
- BT Epstein, Isidore, ed. The Babylonian Talmud. 35 vols. London: The Soncino Press, 1948.
- TOJ Etheridge, J. W. The Targums Of Onkelos And Jonathan Ben Uzziel On The Pentateuch. 2 vols. London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1862.
- Lev. Faley, Roland. "Leviticus." The Jerome Biblical Commentary, pp. 67-85. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968.
- Hex. Field, Fridericus. Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt. 2 vols. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1875.
- ESB Fitzmyer, Joseph A. Essays On The Semitic Background Of The New Testament. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971.
- ST1C Fjärstedt, Biörn. Synoptic Tradition In 1 Corinthians. Themes And Clusters Of Theme Words In 1 Corinthians 1-4 And 9. Stockholm: Rotobekman, 1974.
- DSS Flusser, David. "The Dead Sea Sect And Pre-Pauline Christianity." In Scripta Hierosolymitana, Vol. 4, pp. 215-66. Edited by Chaïm Rabin and Yigael Yadin. Jerusalem: At The Magnes Press, 1958.
- TDNT Foerster, Werner. "δαίμων." In Theological Dictionary Of The New Testament, Vol. 2, pp. 1-20. Edited by Gerhard Kittel; ET and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965.
- OTQJ Freed, Edwin D. Old Testament Quotations In The Gospel Of John. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.



- MR Freedman, H., ed. Midrash Rabbah. 10 vols.  
London: Soncino Press, 1939.
- GP2Cor. Friedrich, Gerhard. "Die Gegner Des Paulus Im  
2. Korintherbrief." In Abraham Unser  
Vater, pp. 181-215. Otto Betz et al.,  
ed. Leiden/Köln: E. J. Brill, 1963.
- UALP Gale, Herbert M. The Use Of Analogy In The  
Letters Of Paul. Philadelphia: The  
Westminster Press, 1964.
- EJM Gard, Donald H. The Exegetical Method Of The  
Greek Translator Of The Book Of Job.  
Philadelphia: Society Of Biblical  
Literature, 1952.
- TCQ Gärtner, Bertil. The Temple And The Community  
In Qumran And The New Testament.  
Cambridge: At The University Press,  
1965.
- GP2Cor. Georgi, Dieter. Die Gegner Des Paulus Im 2.  
Korintherbrief. Neukirchen-Vluyn:  
Neukirchener Verlag, 1964.
- MM Gerhardsson, Birger. Memory And Manuscript.  
ET Eric J. Sharpe. Uppsala: C. W. K.  
Gleerup, 1961.
- T&T ———. Tradition And Transmission In Early  
Christianity. ET Eric J. Sharpe.  
Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1964.
- SIS Gerleman, Gillis. Studies In The Septuagint.  
I. Book Of Job. Lund: C. W. K.  
Gleerup, 1946.
- GKC Gesenius, William. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar.  
ET A. E. Cowley, ed., and E. Kautsch,  
ed. Oxford: At The Clarendon Press,  
1898.
- OTN Gibson, Edgar C. W. The Old Testament In The  
New. London: Wells Gardner, Dorton &  
Co., Ltd., 1907.
- P&Q Gnilya, Joachim. "2 Cor. 6:14-7:1 in the Light  
of the Qumran Texts and the Testaments  
of the Twelve Patriarchs." In Paul And  
Qumran, pp. 48-68. Jerome Murphy-  
O'Connor, ed. London: Geoffrey  
Chapman, 1968.

- IPJ Goodenough, Erwin R. An Introduction To Philo Judaeus. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940.
- RSP Gooding, D. W. Recensions Of The Septuagint Pentateuch. London: The Tyndale Press, 1954.
- RAE ———. Relics Of Ancient Exegesis. A Study Of The Miscellanies In 3 Reigns 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- MAE Goodspeed, Edgar J. Matthew Apostle And Evangelist. Philadelphia: The John C. Winston Company, 1959.
- TDNT Goppelt, Leonhard. "πίνω." In Theological Dictionary Of The New Testament, Vol. 6, pp. 135-60. Edited by Gerhard Kittel; ET and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1968.
- TDNT ———. "τύπος." In Theological Dictionary Of The New Testament, Vol. 8, pp. 246-59. Edited by Gerhard Kittel; ET and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972.
- Typ. ———. Typos. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1939.
- NTQ Gough, Henry. The New Testament Quotations. London: Walton and Maberly, 1855.
- AJNT Grant, Frederick C. Ancient Judaism And The New Testament. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1960.
- GA Grant, Robert M., ed. Gnosticism. An Anthology. London: Collins, 1961.
- SMT Greenup, A. W., ET. Sukkah, Mishna And Tosefta. London: Society For Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1925.
- SCAT Grelot, Pierre. Sens Chrétien De L'Ancien Testament. Tournai: Desclée & Co., 1962.

- SHNT Grinfield, Edv. Gul. Scholia Hellenistica In Novum Testamentum. Londini: Gulielmus Pickering, 1848.
- 1Cor. Grosheide, F. W. Commentary On The First Epistle To The Corinthians. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953.
- BTL Grossfeld, Bernard. A Bibliography Of Targum Literature. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1972.
- SBT Gundry, Robert H. Sōma In Biblical Theology With Emphasis On Pauline Anthropology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- UOTM ———. The Use Of The Old Testament In St. Matthew's Gospel With Special Reference To The Messianic Hope. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.
- POB Gunther, John J. St. Paul's Opponents And Their Background. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.
- OTCR Hagner, Donald Alfred. The Use Of The Old And New Testaments In Clement Of Rome. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.
- PWSM Hamerton-Kelly, R. G. Pre-Existence, Wisdom, And The Son Of Man. A Study Of The Idea Of Pre-Existence In The New Testament. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1973.
- JG&C Hamerton-Kelly, Robert and Robin Scroggs, eds. Jews, Greeks And Christians. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.
- SPTT Hanson, Anthony Tyrrell. Studies In Paul's Technique And Theology. London: SPCK, 1974.
- ATPB Harnack, Adolf von. "Das Alte Testament In Den Paulinischen Briefen Und In Den Paulinischen Gemeinden." In Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, pp. 124-41. Berlin, 1928.

- Test. Harris, J. Rendel. Testimonies. 2 vols. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1916-20.
- IOT Harrison, Roland Kenneth. Introduction To The Old Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1969.
- EBG Hatch, Edwin. Essays In Biblical Greek. Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1889.
- H&R Hatch, Edwin and Henry A. Redpath. A Concordance To The Septuagint And The Other Greek Versions Of The Old Testament. 2 vols. Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954. (Reprint of original)
- GRH Hay, David M. Glory At The Right Hand. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1973.
- SDt. Hempel, Johannes. Die Schichter des Deuteronomiums. Leipzig: R. Voigtländers Verlag, 1914.
- Tier Henry, Marie-Louise. Das Tier Im Religiösen Bewusstsein Des Alttestamentlichen Menschen. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1958.
- 1Cor. Hering, Jean. The First Epistle Of Saint Paul To The Corinthians. ET A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock. London: The Epworth Press, 1962.
- EJ Herr, Moshe David. "Aggadah." In Encyclopaedia Judaica, Vol. 2, pp. 354-66. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House Ltd., 1971.
- PH Hertz, J. H., ed. The Pentateuch And Haftorahs. London: Humphrey Milford, 1928.
- CSOT Higgins, A. J. B. The Christian Significance Of The Old Testament. London: Independent Press Ltd., 1949.
- Hol Holladay, William L. A Concise Hebrew And Aramaic Lexicon Of The Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1971.

- H-P Holmes, A. Robert and Jacob Parsons. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Cum Variis Lectionibus. 4 vols. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1823.
- 2Cor. Hughes, Philip Edgcumbe. Paul's Second Epistle To The Corinthians. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1962.
- MW Hühn, Eugen. Die Messianischen Weissagungen Des Israelitisch-jüdischen Volkes Bis Zu Den Targumim. Leipzig Und Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1899.
- 01Cor Hurd, John Coolidge Jr. The Origin Of I Corinthians. London: S. P. C. K., 1965.
- Ex. Hyatt, J. Philip. Commentary On Exodus. London: Oliphants, 1971.
- Philo James, M. R. The Biblical Antiquities Of Philo. London: Society For Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1917.
- SMS Jellicoe, Sidney. The Septuagint And Modern Study. Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1968.
- QNT0 Johnson, Franklin. The Quotations Of The New Testament From The Old. London: Baptist Tract And Book Society, 1896.
- CAM Kadushin, Max. A Conceptual Approach To The Mekilta. New York: Jonathan David Publishers, 1969.
- CG<sup>2</sup> Kahle, Paule E. The Cairo Geniza<sup>2</sup>. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959.
- POP Käsemann, Ernst. Perspectives On Paul. ET Margaret Kohl. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1971.
- TU63 Katz, Peter. "Justin's Old Testament Quotations And The Greek Dodekapropheton Scroll." In Studia Patristica, Vol. 1, pp. 343-53. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957. Edited by Kurt Aland and F. L. Cross. Texte Und Untersuchungen 63.



- K-B Koehler, Ludwig and Walter Baumgartner, eds. Lexicon In Veteris Testamenti Libros. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953.
- ZWH Kraft, Benedict. Die Zeichen Für Die Wichtigeren Handschriften Des Griechischen Neuen Testaments. Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1955.
- KQT Kuhn, Karl Georg. Konkordanz Zu Den Qumran Texten. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.
- IOY Labuschagne, C. J. The Incomparability Of Yahweh In The Old Testament. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966.
- AGP Lagarde, Paul de. Anmerkungen Zur Griechischen Übersetzung Der Proverbien. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1863.
- PGL Lampe, G. W. H. A Patristic Greek Lexicon. Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1961.
- ET Lampe, G. W. H. and K. J. Woollcombe. Essays On Typology. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1957.
- Mek. Lauterbach, Jacob Z. Mekilta. 3 vols. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society Of America, 1933.
- LJNT Le Déaut, Roger. Liturgie Juive Et Nouveau Testament. Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1965.
- NP ———. La Nuit Pascale. Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1963.
- AUC Lengsfeld, Peter. Adam Und Christus. Essen: Ludgerus-Verlag Hubert Wingen Kg, 1965.
- LS Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones. A Greek-English Lexicon. 2 vols. Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1940.
- HJP Lieberman, Saul. Hellenism In Jewish Palestine. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary Of America, 1962.



- Gal. Lietzmann, D. Hans. An Die Galater. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1923.
- AF Lightfoot, J. B. The Apostolic Fathers. London: Macmillan and Co., 1893.
- HH&T J.H. .A Horae Hebraicae Et Talmudicae: Hebrew And Talmudical Exercitations. ET Robert Gandell. Oxford: At The University Press, 1859.
- NEP J.B. .A Notes On Epistles Of St. Paul. London: Macmillan and Co., 1895.
- NTA Lindars, Barnabas. New Testament Apologetic. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961.
- SPEJ Lyonnet, Stanislas. "Saint Paul Et L'Exégèse Juive De Son Temps." In Mélanges Bibliques. Redigés En L'Honneur De André Robert, pp. 494-506. Tournai: Desclée & Cie Editeurs, 1957.
- N Macho, Alejandro Díez. Neophyti 1. Vol. 1: Genesis. ET Martin McNamara and Michael Maher. Madrid-Barcelona: Consejo Superior De Investigaciones Científicas, 1968.
- RDPT . "The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum: Its Antiquity And Relationship With The Other Targums." In Supplement To Vetus Testamentum, Vol. 7, pp. 222-45. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960.
- PMT Malina, Bruce J. The Palestinian Manna Tradition. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968.
- TH Mansoor, Menahem. The Thanksgiving Hymns. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.
- TDNT Maurer, Christian. "τῆθημι." In Theological Dictionary Of The New Testament, Vol. 8, pp. 152-68. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. ET Geoffrey W. Bromiley, ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972.
- Hos. Mays, James L. Hosea. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1969.



- NTPT McNamara, Martin. The New Testament And The Palestinian Targum To The Pentateuch. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966.
- TT ———. Targum And Testament. Shannon: Irish University Press, 1968.
- 2 Cor. Menzies, Allan. The Second Epistle Of The Apostle Paul To The Corinthians. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1912.
- CHTC Metzger, Bruce M. Chapters In The History Of New Testament Textual Criticism. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963.
- HLS ———. Historical And Literary Studies. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968.
- TNT ———. The Text Of The New Testament. Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1968.
- TCNT ———. A Textual Commentary On The Greek New Testament. London: United Bible Societies, 1971.
- BAM Michalson, Carl. "Bultmann Against Marcion." In The Old Testament And Christian Faith, pp. 49-63. Edited by Bernhard W. Anderson. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1964.
- P&SB Michel, O. Paulus Und Seine Bibel. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1929.
- PG Migne, J.-P., ed. Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Eusebius, Commentary On Isaiah. Petit-Montrange, 1857.
- H&T Milligan, George. Here And There Among The Papyri. London: Hodder And Stoughton Limited, 1922.
- 1 Cor. Moffatt, James. The First Epistle Of Paul To The Corinthians. London: Hodder And Stoughton, 1938.
- JSP Montefiore, C. G. Judaism And St. Paul. London: Max Goschen Ltd., 1914.

- Dan. Montgomery, James A. A Critical And Exegetical Commentary On The Book Of Daniel. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927.
- SAC Morgenstern, Julian. Some Significant Antecedents Of Christianity. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966.
- IBNT Moule, C. F. D. An Idiom Book Of New Testament Greek. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1953.
- 2Cor Moule, Handley C. G. The Second Epistle To The Corinthians. London: Pickering & Inglis Ltd., 1962. Edited by A. W. Handley Moule.
- GNTG Moulton, James Hope and Wilbert Francis Howard. A Grammar Of New Testament Greek, Vol. 2. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1929.
- M&M Moulton, James Hope and George Milligan. The Vocabulary Of The Greek Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1930.
- M&G Moulton, W. F. and A. S. Geden. A Concordance To The Greek Testament. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897.
- IOSCS Muraoka, T. "The Greek Texts Of Samuel-Kings: Incomplete Translations Or Recensional Activity?" In Septuagint And Cognate Studies, Number Two, pp. 90-107. Edited by Robert A. Kraft. IOSCS Proceedings, 1972.
- Psa. Murphy, Roland E. "Psalms." In The Jerome Biblical Commentary, pp. 569-602. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968.
- PQ Murphy-O'Connor, ed. Paul And Qumran. Studies In New Testament Exegesis. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968.
- NT Nestle, Eberhard, ed. Novum Testamentum Graece.<sup>25</sup> Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt Stuttgart, 1963.
- DH Neuenzeit, Paul. Das Herrenmahl. München: Kösel-Verlag, 1960.

- ERJ Neusner, Jacob. Early Rabbinic Judaism.  
Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975.
- JGC ———. "Method And Substance In The History  
Of Judaic Ideas: An Exercise." In  
Jews, Greeks And Christians. Robert  
Hamerton-Kelly and Robin Scroggs, eds.,  
pp. 89-111. Leiden: E. J. Brill,  
1976.
- RT ———. The Rabbinic Traditions About The  
Pharisees Before 70. 3 vols. Leiden:  
E. J. Brill, 1971.
- TNT Nickels, Peter. Targum And New Testament. A  
Bibliography Together With A New Testa-  
ment Index. Rome: Pontifical Biblical  
Institute, 1967.
- NTU Nicole, Roger. "New Testament Use Of The Old  
Testament." In Revelation And The  
Bible, pp. 135-51. London: The  
Tyndale Press, 1958.
- ExNT Nixon, R. E. The Exodus In The New Testament.  
London: The Tyndale Press, 1963.
- ZBM Noth, Martin. Das Zweite Buch Mose. Göttingen:  
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959.
- TDNT Oepke, Albrecht. "καλούμιά." In Theological  
Dictionary Of The New Testament, Vol. 3,  
pp. 556-92. Edited by Gerhard Kittel.  
ET and edited by Geoffrey Bromiley.  
Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publish-  
ing Company, 1965.
- TDNT ———. "κρούπτω." In Theological Dictionary  
Of The New Testament, Vol. 3, pp. 957-  
1000. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. ET and  
edited by Geoffrey Bromiley. Grand  
Rapids: W. M. Eerdmans Publishing  
Company, 1965.
- AJ Oostendorp, Derk William. Another Jesus.  
Amsterdam: J. H. Kok, N. V. Kampen,  
1967.
- 1Cor. Orr, William F. and James Arthur Walther. I  
Corinthians. New York: Doubleday &  
Company, Inc., 1976.

- MQ Owen, Henry. The Modes Of Quotation Used By The Evangelical Writers Explained And Vindicated. London: J. Nichols, 1789.
- EJH Patte, Daniel. Early Jewish Hermeneutic In Palestine. Missoula, Montana: Society Of Biblical Literature And Scholars Press, 1975.
- Q11 Ploeg, J. Van Der. Le Targum De Job De La Grotte 11 De Qumran. Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1962.
- STB Plooi, D. "Studies In The Testimony Book." In Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie Van Wetenschappen. Afdeeling Letterkunde. Nieuwe Reeks, dl. 32, no. 2. Amsterdam: Uitgave Van D. N. V. Noorhollandsche Uitgevers-Maatschappij, 1932.
- 2Cor. Plummer, Alfred. A Critical And Exegetical Commentary On The Second Epistle Of St. Paul To The Corinthians. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1915.
- EBar. Prigent, Pierre. L'Épître De Barnabé I-XVI Et Ses Sources. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1961.
- ZD Rabin, Chaim. The Zadokite Documents. Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1954.
- FBM Rad, Gerhard von. Das Fünfte Buch Mose. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.
- Dt. ———. Studies In Deuteronomy. ET David Stalker. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1953.
- Psa. Rahlfs, Alfred. Psalmi Cum Odis. Septuaginta, Vol. 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931.
- LXX Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. Septuaginta. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.
- VGH ———. Verzeichnis Der Griechischen Handschriften Des Alten Testaments. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1914.

- TPNT      Randolph, Thomas. The Prophecies, And The Texts, Cited In The New Testament, Compared With The Hebrew Original And With The Septuagint Version. Oxford: L. and J. Fletcher, 1782.
- IA         Reider, Joseph. An Index To Aquila. Completed and Revised by Nigel Turner. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966.
- SPCI      Renard, Henri. "La Lecture De L'Ancien Testament Par Saint Paul." In Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus, Vol. 2, pp. 207-15. Rome: E Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1963.
- Ag.        Resch, Alfred. Agrapha. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906.
- AT&B      Riesenfeld, Harald. The Gospel Tradition And Its Beginnings. London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Limited, 1957.
- LTP        \_\_\_\_\_; "Le Langage Parabolique Dans Les Épîtres De Saint Paul." In Littérature Et Théologie Pauliniennes. Louvain: Desclée De Brouwer, 1960, pp. 47-59. Recherches Bibliques 5. A. Descamps et al, contributors.
- BEF        Roberts, Bleddyn J. "Bible Exegesis And Fulfilment In Qumran." In Words And Meanings, pp. 195-207. Edited by Peter R. Ackroyd and Barnabas Lindars. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1968.
- OTT        \_\_\_\_\_ . The Old Testament Text And Versions. Cardiff: University Of Wales Press, 1951.
- ATR        Robertson, A. T. A Grammar Of The Greek New Testament In The Light Of Historical Research. New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1914.
- 1Cor.      Robertson, Archibald and Alfred Plummer. A Critical And Exegetical Commentary On The First Epistle Of St. Paul To The Corinthians. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911.

- R&R Robinson, H. Wheeler, ed. Record And Revelation. Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1938.
- DSJ Ropes, James Hardy. "Die Sprüche Jesu Die In Den Kanonischen Evangelien Nicht Überliefert Sind." In Texte Und Untersuchungen 14, number 2, pp. 1-176. 1896.
- JADSS Rowley, H. H. Jewish Apocalyptic And The Dead Sea Scrolls. London: The Athlone Press, 1957.
- Hos. Rudolph, Wilhelm. Hosea. Stuttgart: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1966.
- BT Russell, D. S. Between The Testaments. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1960.
- MMJA ———. The Method And Message Of Jewish Apocalyptic. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1964.
- PHS Ryle, Herbert Edward. Philo And Holy Scripture. London: Macmillan And Co., 1895.
- TOF Sampley, J. Paul. 'And The Two Shall Become One Flesh.' Cambridge: At The University Press, 1971.
- CQC Sanders, J. A. "Cave II Surprises And The Question Of Canon." In The Canon And Masorah Of The Hebrew Bible, pp. 37-51. Edited by Sid Z. Leiman. New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1974.
- OTI Sandmel, Samuel. "The Haggada Within Scripture." In Old Testament Issues, pp. 94-118. Edited by Samuel Sandmel. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1969.
- Q&C Scharlemann, Martin H. Qumran And Corinth. New York: Bookman Associates, 1962.
- LTP Schlier, H. "La notion paulinienne de la Parole de Dieu." In Littérature Et Théologie Pauliniennes, pp. 127-41. Louvain: Desclée De Brouwer, 1960.

- GIC Schmithals, Walter. Gnosticism In Corinth.  
ET John E. Steely. Nashville:  
Abingdon Press, 1971.
- PAG ———. Paul And The Gnostics. ET J. E.  
Steely. Nashville: Abingdon Press,  
1972.
- ATNT Schmitz, D. Otto. "Das Alte Testament Im  
Neuen Testament." In Wort Und Geist,  
pp. 49-74. Berlin: Im Furche-Verlag,  
1934.
- P Schoeps, H. J. Paul. ET Harold Knight. London:  
Lutterworth Press, 1961.
- TDNT Schrenk, Gottlob. "γράφω." In Theological  
Dictionary Of The New Testament,  
Vol. I, pp. 742-61. Edited by Gerhard  
Kittel. ET and edited by Geoffrey  
Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B.  
Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964.
- TDNT Schulz, Siegfried and Gottfried Quell.  
"σπέρμα." In Theological Dictionary Of  
The New Testament, Vol. 7, pp. 536-57.  
Edited by Gerhard Kittel. ET and  
edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand  
Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing  
Company, 1971.
- PHI Schweitzer, Albert. Paul And His Interpreters.  
ET W. Montgomery. London: Adam and  
Charles Black, 1912.
- TDNT Schweizer, Eduard. "πνεῦμα, πνευματικός." In  
Theological Dictionary Of The New  
Testament, Vol. 6, pp. 332-455. Edited  
by Gerhard Kittel. ET and edited by  
Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm.  
B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1968.
- TDP Scott, Melville. Textual Discoveries In  
Proverbs, Psalms, And Isaiah. London:  
Society For Promoting Christian  
Knowledge, 1927.
- LA Scroggs, Robin. The Last Adam. Oxford: Basil  
Blackwell, 1966.



- P&S        Sevenster, J. N. Paul And Seneca. Leiden:  
                 I. J. Brill, 1961.
- CRD        Shenkel, James Donald. Chronology And  
                 Recensional Development In The Greek  
                 Text Of Kings. Cambridge: Harvard  
                 University Press, 1968.
- OTJ        Sibinga, Joost Smit. The Old Testament Text Of  
                 Justin Martyr. I. The Pentateuch.  
                 Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963.
- A&O        Silverstone, A. E. Aquila And Onkelos.  
                 Manchester: Manchester University  
                 Press, 1931.
- GNOT       Skehan, Patrick W. "Greek Versions Of The Old  
                 Testament." In The Jerome Biblical  
                 Commentary, Vol. 2, pp. 569-74.  
                 London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968.
- VT        ————. "The Qumran Manuscripts And Textual  
                 Criticism." In Vetus Testamentum  
                 Congress Volume, pp. 148-60. Leiden:  
                 E. J. Brill, 1957.
- UOTN       Smith, D. Moody. "The Use Of The Old Testament  
                 In The New." In The Use Of The Old  
                 Testament In The New And Other Essays,  
                 pp. 3-65. Edited by James M. Efird.  
                 Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press,  
                 1972.
- Deut.       Smith, Sir George Adam. The Book Of  
                 Deuteronomy. Cambridge: At The  
                 University Press, 1918.
- BI        ————. The Book Of Isaiah. 2 vols.  
                 London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1903.
- HPH        Sowers, Sidney G. The Hermeneutics Of Philo  
                 And Hebrews. Zurich: EVZ-Verlag,  
                 1965.
- BIA        Sperber, Alexander. The Bible In Aramaic.  
                 Vol. 4B. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.
- LS        Spiess, Edmund. Logos Spermaticos. Leipzig:  
                 Verlag Von Wilhelm Engelmann, 1871.
- SSM        Stendahl, Krister. The School Of St. Matthew.  
                 Uppsala: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1954.



- TI Stenning, J. F. The Targum Of Isaiah.  
Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1949.
- DIC Stephenson, A. M. G. "A Defense Of The  
Integrity Of 2 Corinthians." In The  
Authorship And Integrity Of The New  
Testament, pp. 82-97. London:  
S. P. C. K., 1965.
- S-B Strack, Hermann L. and Paul Billerbeck. Die  
Briefe Des Neuen Testaments Und Die  
Offenbarung Johannis Erlautert Aus  
Talmud Und Midrasch. Vol. 3 of  
Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament Aus  
Talmud Und Midrasch. 6 vols. München:  
C. H. Beck'sche Verlags Buchhandlung,  
1954-1961.
- ITM Strack, Hermann. Introduction To The Talmud  
And Midrash. Philadelphia: Jewish  
Publication Society Of America, 1931.
- BK Surenhusius, Guiljelmus. "ספר המשנה BIBΛΟΣ  
ΚΑΤΑΛΛΑΓΗΣ." In Quo Secundum Veterum  
Theologorum Hebraeorum. Amstelaedami:  
Johannes Boom, 1713.
- OTG Swete, Henry Barclay. The Old Testament In  
Greek. Vol. 1, 1901; Vol. 2, 1891;  
Vol. 3, 1894. Cambridge: At The  
University Press.
- IOTG ———. An Introduction To The Old Testament  
In Greek. Cambridge: At The Univer-  
sity Press, 1914.
- CHB Talmon, Shemaryahu. "The Old Testament Text."  
In The Cambridge History Of The Bible,  
Vol. 1, pp. 159-99. Cambridge: At The  
University Press, 1970. Edited by  
P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans.
- OTNT Tasker, R. V. G. The Old Testament In The New  
Testament. London: S.C.M. Press Ltd.,  
1946.
- AM Tertullian. Adversus Marcionem. Books I-III.  
ET and edited by Ernest Evans. Oxford:  
At The Clarendon Press, 1972.
- LTP Testuz, M. "La correspondance apocryphe de  
saint Paul et des Corinthiens." In  
Littérature Et Théologie Pauliniennes,  
pp. 217-23. Louvain: Desclée De  
Brouwer, 1960.

- RPJT Thackeray, Henry St. John. The Relation Of St. Paul To Contemporary Jewish Thought. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1900.
- SJW ———. The Septuagint And Jewish Worship. London: Oxford University Press, 1921.
- ATNT Tholuck, A. Das Alte Testament Im Neuen Testament. Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1868.
- BILA Thomson, John I. H. Books Which Influenced Our Lord And His Apostles. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1891.
- NTG Tischendorf, Constantinus. Novum Testamentum Graece. 3 vols. Lipsiae: Geisecke & Devrient, 1869-1894.
- Ezek. Tkacik, Arnold J. "Ezekiel." In The Jerome Biblical Commentary, pp. 344-65. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968.
- IOSCS Tov, Emanuel. "The State Of The Question: Problems And Proposed Solutions." In Septuagint And Cognate Studies, Number Two, pp. 3-12. Edited by Robert A. Kraft, IOSCS Proceedings, 1972.
- RESE Towner, Wayne Sibley. The Rabbinic "Enumeration Of Scriptural Examples." Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.
- QNT Toy, Crawford Howell. Quotations In The New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884.
- NTVO Turpie, David McCalman. The New Testament View Of The Old. London: Hodder And Stoughton, 1872.
- OTN ———. The Old Testament In The New. London: Williams and Norgate, 1868.
- JGC Urbach, Ephraim E. "Halakhah And History." In Jews, Greeks And Christians, pp. 112-28. Edited by Robert Hammerton-Kelly. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.

- CHB Vermes, G. "Bible And Midrash: Early Old Testament Exegesis." In The Cambridge History Of The Bible, Vol. 1, pp. 199-231. Edited by P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1970.
- STJ Vermes, G. Scripture And Tradition In Judaism. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.
- CSOT Waard, J. De. A Comparative Study Of The Old Testament Texts In The Dead Sea Scrolls And In The New Testament. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.
- TS Walters, Peter. The Text Of The Septuagint. Edited by D. W. Gooding. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1973.
- P&F Weingreen, J. "Exposition In The Old Testament And In Rabbinic Literature." In Promise And Fulfilment, pp. 187-201. Edited by F. F. Bruce. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.
- 1 Kor. Weiss, Johannes. Der erste Korintherbrief. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1925.
- Kor. Wendland, Heinz-Dietrich. Die Briefe an die Korinther. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954.
- NTG Westcott, Brooke Foss and Fenton John Anthony Hort. The New Testament In The Original Greek. Cambridge and London: Macmillan and Co., 1881.
- GLXX Wevers, John William. Septuaginta Genesis. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974.
- PEH Williamson, Ronald. Philo And The Epistle To The Hebrews. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.
- 2 Kor. Windisch, Hans. Der Zweite Korintherbrief. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924.
- Hos. Wolff, Hans Walter. Dodekapropheton 1 Hosea. Wageningen, Netherlands: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961.

- HDB Woods, F. H. "Quotations." In A Dictionary Of The Bible, Vol. 4, pp. 184-88. Edited by James Hastings. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902.
- Gött. Ziegler, Joseph, ed. Septuaginta Duodecim Prophetæ, Vol. XIII. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943.
- Gött. ———. Septuaginta Ezekiel, Vol. XVI. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1952.
- Gött. ———. Septuaginta Isaias, Vol. XIV. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939.

#### PERIODICALS

- NTS 16 Albright, W. F. and Mann, C. S. "Two Texts In I Corinthians," New Testament Studies 16 (1969-70): 271-76.
- JBL 77 Allegro, J. M. "Fragments Of A Qumran Scroll Of Eschatological Midrāsîm," Journal Of Biblical Literature 77 (1958): 350-54.
- JBL 75 ———. "Further Messianic References In Qumran Literature," Journal Of Biblical Literature 75 (1956): 174-84.
- NTS 17 Allen, Leslie C. "The Old Testament Background Of (ΠΡΟ) 'ΟΡΙΖΕΙΝ In The New Testament," New Testament Studies 17 (1970-71): 104-09.
- RSR 63 Amsler, Samuel. "Le Dernier Et L'Avant-Dernier," Recherches De Science Religieuse 63 (1975): 385-96.
- JTVI 79 Atkinson, B.F.C. "The Textual Background Of The Use Of The Old Testament By The New," Journal Of The Transactions Of The Victoria Institute 79 (1947): 39-60.
- RB 70 Audet, Jean-Paul. "L'Hypothèse Des Testimonia," Revue Biblique 70 (1963): 381-405.

- EQ 41 Aune, David E. "Early Christian Biblical Interpretation," Evangelical Quarterly 41 (1969): 89-96.
- CBQ 28 Bahr, G. J. "Paul & Letter Writing In The 1st Century," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 28 (1966): 465-77.
- NT 17 Bailey, K. E. "Recovering The Poetic Structure Of I Cor. 11:7-11," Novum Testamentum 17 (1975): 265-96.
- NTS 17 Balch, D. L. "Backgrounds Of I Cor. VII: Sayings Of The Lord In Q; Moses As An Ascetic ΘΕΙΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ In II Cor. III," New Testament Studies 17 (1972): 351-64.
- JQR 66 Bamberger, Bernard J. "Halakic Elements In The Neofiti Targum: A Preliminary Statement," Jewish Quarterly Review 66 (1975): 27-38.
- JBL 68 Bamberger, Bernard J. "The Dating Of Aggadic Materials," Journal Of Biblical Literature 68 (1949): 115-23.
- CTJ 6 Bandstra, Andrew. "Interpretation In 1 Corinthians 1-11," Calvin Theological Journal 6 (1971): 5-21.
- SJT 19 Barbour, R. S. Review of "Tradition & Transmission In Early Christianity by Birger Gerhardsson," Scottish Journal of Theology 19 (1960): 114-15.
- NTS 17 Barrett, C. K. "Paul's Opponents In II Corinthians," New Testament Studies 17 (1970-71): 233-54.
- JTS 16 ———. Review of "Tradition & Transmission In Early Christianity by Birger Gerhardsson," Journal of Theological Studies 16 (1965): 488-89.
- RB 60 Barthélemy, D. "Redécouverte D'Un Chânon Manquant De L'Histoire De La Septante," Revue Biblique 60 (1953): 18-29.
- NTS 12 Bates, W. H. "The Integrity Of II Corinthians," New Testament Studies 12 (1965): 56-69.

- BS 77      Bates, W. H. "Quotations In The New Testament From The Old Testament," Bibliotheca Sacra 77 (1920): 424-28.
- NTS 13     Batey, Richard. "The MIA ΣΑΡΕ Union of Christ And The Church," New Testament Studies 13 (1966-67): 270-81.
- ZNW 50     Bauer, Johannes Bapt. ". . . ΤΟΙΣ ΑΓΑΠΩΣΙΝ ΤΟΝ ΘΕΟΝ," Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 50 (1959): 106-12.
- RSR 63     Beauchamp, Paul. "L'Interprétation Figurative Et Ses Présupposés," Recherches De Science Religieuse 63 (1975): 299-312.
- JBL 92     Betz, Hans Dieter. "2 Cor. 6:14-7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?" Journal Of Biblical Literature 92 (1973): 88-108.
- NTS 18     Black, Matthew. "The Christological Use Of The Old Testament In The New Testament," New Testament Studies 18 (1971-72): 1-14.
- SJT 7      Black, Matthew. "The Pauline Doctrine Of The Second Adam," Scottish Journal Of Theology 7 (1954): 170-79.
- TD 2       Blaser, P. "S. Paul's Use Of The Old Testament," Theology Digest 2 (1954): 49-53.
- RSR 43     Bloch, Renée. "Note Methodologique Pour L'Etude De La Litterature Rabbinique," Recherches De Science Religieuse 43 (1955): 194-227.
- NRT 65     Bonsirven, J. "S. Paul et l'Ancien Testament," Nouvelle Revue Théologique 65 (1938): 129-47.
- ZTK 59     Braun, Herbert. "Das Alte Testament In Neuen Testament," Zeitschrift Für Theologie Und Kirche 59 (1962): 16-31.
- Bib. 56     Brock, Sebastian. "A Doublet And Its Ramifications," Biblica 56 (1975): 550-53.
- JTS 20     ————. Review of "The Septuagint and Modern Study by Sidney Jellicoe," Journal Of Theological Studies 20 (Oct. 1969): 574-81.

- JBL 83 Bronson, David B. "Paul And Apocalyptic Judaism," Journal Of Biblical Literature 83 (1964): 287-92.
- BA 14 Brownlee, William H. "Biblical Interpretation Among The Sectaries Of The Dead Sea Scrolls," The Biblical Archaeologist 14 (Sept. 1951): 54-76.
- BJRL 56 Bruce, F. F. "Paul And The Historical Jesus," Bulletin Of The John Rylands Library 56 (1974): 317-35.
- BJRL 57 ———. "Paul And The Law Of Moses," Bulletin Of The John Rylands Library 57 (1975): 259-79.
- NTS 2 ———. "Qumran And Early Christianity," New Testament Studies 2 (1955-56): 176ff.
- Bib. 55 Bucher, Theodor G. "Die Logische Argumentation In 1. Korinther 15,12-20," Biblica 55 (1974): 465-86.
- TL 75 Bultmann, Rudolf. "Ursprung Und Sinn Der Typologie Als Hermeneutischer Methode," Theologische Literaturzeitung 75 (1950): 205-12.
- ZNW 62 Burkill, T. A. "Two Into One: The Notion of Carnal Union in Mark 10:8; 1 Kor. 6:16; Eph. 5:31," Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 62 (1971): 115-20.
- JQR 10 Burkitt, F. C. "Aquila," The Jewish Quarterly Review 10 (1897-98): 207-16.
- RB 63 Carmignac, J. "Les Citation de L'Ancien Testament dans 'La Guerre des Fils de Lumière Contre les Fils de Tenebres,'" Revue Biblique 63 (1956): 234-60; 375-90.
- NTS 23 Carr, Wesley. "The Rulers Of This Age - I Corinthians II.6-8," New Testament Studies 23 (1976): 20-35.
- RSPT 55 Carrez, Maurice. "La Méthode De G. von Rad Appliquée A Quelques Textes Pauliniens," Revue Des Sciences Philosophiques Et Theologiques 55 (1971): 81-95.



- RSR 63 Carrez, Maurice. "Présence Et Fonctionnement De L'Ancien Testament Dans L'Annonce De L'Évangile," Recherches De Science Religieuse 63 (1975): 325-42.
- EQ 43 Cassidy, Ronald. "Paul's Attitude To Death In II Cor. 5:1-10," Evangelical Quarterly 43 (1971): 210-17.
- RHE 27 Cerfaux, L. "Vestiges D'Un Florilège Dans 1 Cor., I, 18-III, 24?" Revue D'Histoire Ecclesiastique 27 (1931): 521-34.
- Int. 23 Childs, Brevard S. "Psalm 8 In The Context Of The Christian Canon," Interpretation 23 (1969): 20-31.
- Ist. 20 Commission Foi et Constitution. "La Rélation Entre L'Ancien Et Le Nouveau Testament," Istina 20 (1975): 253-61.
- NTS 12 Conzelmann, H. "Paulus Und Die Weisheit," New Testament Studies 12 (1965-66): 231-44.
- CBQ 4 Costello, C. "The Old Testament In Saint Paul's Epistles," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 4 (1942): 141-45.
- RSR 36 Courtade, Gaston. "Le Sens De L'Histoire Dans L'Écriture Et La Classification Usuelle Des Sens Scripturaires," Recherches De Science Religieuse 36 (1949): 136-41.
- HTR 57 Cross, Frank Moore Jr., "The History Of The Biblical Text In The Light Of Discoveries In The Judaean Desert," Harvard Theological Review 57 (1964): 281-99.
- BASOR 132 ———. "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related To The Original Hebrew Underlying The Septuagint," Bulletin Of The American Schools Of Oriental Research 132 (1953): 15-26.
- CBQ 17 Dahood, Mitchell J. "Two Pauline Quotations from the OT," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 17 (Ja. 1955): 19-24.
- HUCA 22 Daube, David. "Rabbinic Methods Of Interpretation And Hellenistic Rhetoric," Hebrew Union College Annual 22 (1949): 239-64.



- CS 2-4 Démann, Paul. "Moïse Et La Loi Dans La Pensée De Saint Paul," Cahiers Sioniens 2-4 (1954): 189-242.
- NT 6 Díaz, José Ramón. "Palestinian Targum And The New Testament," Novum Testamentum 6 (1963): 75-80.
- TEH 126 Dietzfelbinger, Christian. "Helisgeschichte bei Paulus?" Theologische Existenz Heute 126 (1965): 5-45.
- ET Dodds, Marcus. "Twenty Misused Scripture Texts; I Cor. 2:9," Expository Times 6 (1894-95): 201.
- JTS 21 Dunn, J. D. G. "2 Corinthians III.17-The Lord Is The Spirit," Journal Of Theological Studies 21 (1970): 309-20.
- CTJ 4 Dykstra, William. "1 Corinthians 15:20-28, an Essential Part of Paul's Argument Against Those Who Deny the Resurrection," Calvin Theological Journal 4 (1969): 195-211.
- NTS 9 Edgar, S. L. "Respect For Context In Quotations From The Old Testament," New Testament Studies 9 (1962-63): 55-62.
- JBL 76 Ellis, E. Earle. "A Note On First Corinthians 10:4," Journal Of Biblical Literature 76 (1957): 53-56.
- NTS 2 ———. "A Note On Pauline Hermeneutics," New Testament Studies 2 (1956): 127-33.
- JQR 66 Faur, José. "The Targumim And Halakha," Jewish Quarterly Review 66 (1975): 19-26.
- NTS 23 Fee, Gordon D. "II Corinthians VI. 14-VII. 1 And Food Offered To Idols," New Testament Studies 23 (1977): 140-61.
- TB 22 Fensham, E. C. "The Covenant As Giving Expression To The Relationship Between Old And New Testament," Tyndale Bulletin 22 (1971): 82-94.

- TD 14      Feuillet, André. "The Enigma Of 1 Corinthians 2:9," Theology Digest 14 (1966): 143-48.
- RB 70      \_\_\_\_\_ . "L'Énigme De I Cor., II,9," Revue Biblique 70 (1963): 52-74.
- SMR 8      \_\_\_\_\_ . "L'Explication 'Typologique' Des Evenements Du Désert En 1 Cor. 10:1-4," Studia Montis Regii 8 (1965): 115-35.
- BA 9      Filson, Floyd V. "The Septuagint And The New Testament," Biblical Archaeologist 9 (1946): 34-42.
- RQ 4      Finkel, Asher. "The Pesher Of Dreams And Scriptures," Revue De Qumran 4 (1963-64): 357-70.
- CBQ 38      Fiorenza, Elisabeth Schüssler. "Cultic Language In Qumran And In The New Testament," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 38 (1976): 159-77.
- CBQ 32      Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "Review of Neophyti 1 by Alejandro Díez Macho," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 32 (1970): 107-112.
- NTS 7      \_\_\_\_\_ . "The Use of Explicit OT Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the NT," New Testament Studies 7 (1960-61): 297-333.
- CBQ 23      \_\_\_\_\_ . "Qumran and the Interpolated Paragraph in 2 Cor. 6,14-7,1," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 23 (1961): 271-80.
- NTS 21      Ford, J. Massyngberde. "You Are God's 'Sukkah,' 1 Cor. 3:10-17," New Testament Studies 21 (1974): 139-42.
- JBL 94      Gamble, Harry. "The Redaction Of The Pauline Letters And The Formation Of The Pauline Corpus," Journal Of Biblical Literature 94 (1975): 403-18.
- NTS 14      Gärtner, Bertil E. "The Pauline and Johannine Idea of 'To Know God' Against the Hellenistic Background," New Testament Studies 14 (1967): 209-31.

- JBL 68 Gehman, Henry. "The Theological Approach Of The Greek Translator Of Job 1-15," Journal Of Biblical Literature 68 (1949): 231-40.
- JSS 7 Gertner, M. "Midrashim In The New Testament," Journal Of Semitic Studies 7 (1962): 267-92.
- JBL 87 Goldsmith, Dale. "Acts 13:33-37: A Peshier On II Samuel 7," Journal Of Biblical Literature 87 (1968): 321-24.
- JTS 25 Gooding, D. W. "On the Use of the LXX for Dating Midrashic Elements in the Targums," Journal Of Theological Studies ns25 (1974): 1-11.
- TB 26 ———. "A Recent Popularisation Of Professor F. M. Cross' Theories On The Text Of The Old Testament," Tyndale Bulletin 26 (1975): 113-32.
- Int. 21 Goppelt, Leonhard. "Paul And Heilsgeschichte," ET Mathias Rissi, Interpretation 21 (1967): 315-26.
- NTS 13 ———. "Paulus Und Die Heilsgeschichte. Schlussfolgerungen Aus Röm. IV Und I Kor. X. 1-13," New Testament Studies 13 (1966): 31-42.
- KD 4 ———. "Tradition Nach Paulus," Kerygma Und Dogma 4 (1958): 213-33.
- HUCA 22 Gordis, Robert. "Quotations As A Literary Usage In Biblical, Oriental And Rabbinic Literature," Hebrew Union College Annual 22 (1949): 157-219.
- T 3 Goshen-Gottstein, M. H. "Theory And Practice Of Textual Criticism: The Text-Critical Use Of The Septuagint," Textus 3 (1963): 130-58.
- VT 3 ———. "Bible Quotations In The Sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls," Vetus Testamentum 3 (1953): 79-82.
- CBQ 17 Grech, Prosper. "2 Corinthians 3,17 and the Pauline Doctrine of Conversion to the Holy Spirit," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 17 (1955): 420-37.

- NTS 19 ————. "The 'Testimonia' And Modern Hermeneutics," New Testament Studies 19 (1973): 318-24.
- CBQ 31 Grindel, John A. "Another Characteristic Of The KAIGE Recension: πυλ/νικος," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 31 (1969): 499-513.
- CBQ 29 ————. "Matthew 12, 18-21," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 29 (1967): 110-15.
- TB 18 Grogan, G. W. "The New Testament Interpretation Of The Old Testament," Tyndale Bulletin 18 (1967): 54-76.
- Th 53 Hanson, R. P. C. "St. Paul's Quotations Of The Book Of Job," Theology 53 (1950): 250-53.
- CBQ 33 Harrington, Daniel J. "The Biblical Text Of Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 33 (1971): 1-17.
- ET 27 Harris, Rendel. "A Quotation from Judith in the Pauline Epistles," Expository Times 27 (1915-16): 13-15.
- ET 36 ————. "Did Jesus Use Testimonies?" Expository Times 36 (1924-25): 410-13.
- ET 32 ————. "Traces of Targumism in the New Testament," Expository Times 32 (1920-21): 373-76.
- CBQ 38 Harrisville, Roy A. "Speaking In Tongues: A Lexicographical Study," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 38 (1976): 35-48.
- ZNW 66 Hickling, C. J. A. "Is The Second Epistle To The Corinthians A Source For Early Church History?" Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 66 (1975): 284-87.
- NTS 21 ————. "The Sequence Of Thought In II Corinthians, Chapter Three," New Testament Studies 21 (1975): 380-95.
- ZNW 66 Hofius, Otfried. "Das Zitat 1 Kor 2:9 und das koptische Testament des Jakob," Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 66 (1975): 140-42.

- TL 99 Holtz, Traugott. "Zur Interpretation Des Alten Testaments Im Neuen Testament," Theologische Literaturzeitung 99 (1974): 19-32.
- NTS 10 Hooker, Morna D. "'Beyond The Things Which Are Written': An Examination of I Cor. IV. 6," New Testament Studies 10 (1963-64): 127-32.
- NTS 21 ———. "The Johannine Prologue And The Messianic Secret," New Testament Studies 21 (1975): 40-58.
- T 8 Howard, George. "KAIGE Readings In Josephus," Textus 8 (1973): 45-54.
- JBL 96 ———. "The Tetragram And The New Testament," Journal Of Biblical Literature 96 (1977): 63-83.
- EQ 41 Howard, J. K. "Christ Our Passover: A Study Of The Passover-Exodus Theme in I Corinthians," Evangelical Quarterly 41 (1969): 97-108.
- ZAW 20 Irwin, William A. "The Interpretation of The Old Testament," Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 20 (1950): 1-10.
- ET 78 Jasper, F. N. "The Relation Of The Old Testament To The New," Expository Times 78 (1967): 228-32; 267-70.
- JQR 59 Jellicoe, Sidney. "Aquila And His Version," Jewish Quarterly Review 59 (1968): 326-32.
- VT 23 ———. "Some Reflections On The KAIGE Recension," Vetus Testamentum 23 (1973): 15-24.
- NTS 2 Jeremias, Joachim. "Flesh And Blood Cannot Inherit The Kingdom Of God," New Testament Studies 2 (1956): 151-59.
- HTR 36 Johnson, Sherman E. "The Biblical Quotations In Matthew," Harvard Theological Review 36 (1943): 135-53.
- JBL 56 ———. "The Septuagint And The New Testament," Journal Of Biblical Literature 56 (1937): 331-45.

- NT 4 De Jonge, M. "Christian Influence In The Testaments Of The Twelve Patriarchs," Novum Testamentum 4 (1960): 182-235.
- HUCA 8-9 Kaminka, A. "Septuaginta Und Targum Zu Proverbia," Hebrew Union College Annual 8-9 (1931-32): 169-91.
- ZNW 49 Katz, Peter. "The Quotations From Deuteronomy In Hebrews," Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 49 (1958): 213-23.
- NTS 14 Kempthorne, R. "Incest and the Body of Christ: A Study of 1 Corinthians VI. 12-20," New Testament Studies 14 (1967): 568-74.
- Ex 10 King, E. G. "St. Paul's Method Of Quotation," Expositor 10 (1889): 233-38.
- JBL 79 Kraft, Robert A. "Barnabas' Isaiah Text And The 'Testimony Book' Hypothesis," Journal Of Biblical Literature 79 (1960): 336-50.
- JBL 78 Lane, William R. "A New Commentary Structure In 4Q Florilegium," Journal Of Biblical Literature 78 (1959): 343-46.
- JQR 5&6 Lauterbach, Jacob Z. "Midrash And Mishnah A Study In The Early History Of The Halakah," Jewish Quarterly Review 5 (1914-15): 503-27; 6 (1915-16): 23-95.
- Bib. 50 Le Déaut, Roger. "A Propos D'Une Définition Du Midrash," Biblica 50 (1969): 395-413.  
ET Mary C. Howard in Interpretation 25 (1971): 259-82.
- BTB 4 ———. "The Current State Of Targumic Studies," Biblical Theology Bulletin 4 (1974): 3-32.
- BTB 4 ———. "Targumic Literature And New Testament Interpretation," Biblical Theology Bulletin 4 (1974): 244-87.
- Bib. 42 ———. "Traditions Targumiques Dans Le Corpus Paulinien?" Biblica 42 (1961): 28-48.

- ZNW 62 Lee, G. M. "Philostratus and St. Paul,"  
Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche  
Wissenschaft 62 (1971): 121.
- NTS 23 Lindars, Barnabas and Peder Borgen. "The Place  
Of The Old Testament In The Formation  
Of New Testament Theology: Prolegomena  
And Response," New Testament Studies 23  
(1976): 59-75.
- ZNW 47 Lohse, Eduard. "Zu 1 Kor 10, 26-31,"  
Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche  
Wissenschaft 47 (1956): 277-80.
- TB 21 Longenecker, Richard N. "Can We Reproduce The  
Exegesis Of The New Testament?"  
Tyndale Bulletin 21 (1970): 3-38.
- NTS 1 Macgregor, G. H. C. "Principalities And Powers:  
The Cosmic Background Of Paul's  
Thought," New Testament Studies 1  
(1954-55): 17-28.
- BZ 20 Maier, Friedrich Wilhelm. "Ps 110,1 (LXX 109,1)  
Im Zusammenhang Von 1 Kor 15, 24-26,"  
Biblische Zeitschrift 20 (1932): 139-56.
- CV 13 Mánek, Jindřich. "Composite Quotations In The  
New Testament And Their Purpose,"  
Communio Viatorum 13 (1970): 181-88.
- JTS 46 Manson, T. W. "The Argument From Prophecy,"  
Journal Of Theological Studies 46  
(1945): 129-36.
- BJRL 26 ———. "St. Paul In Ephesus: The Corinthian  
Correspondence," Bulletin Of The John  
Rylands Library 26 (1941): 101-20.
- BJRL 34 ———. "The Old Testament In The Teaching Of  
Jesus," Bulletin Of The John Rylands  
Library 34 (1952): 312-32.
- ZNW 30 Marmorstein, Arthur. "Paulus Und Die Rabbinen,"  
Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche  
Wissenschaft 30 (1931): 271-85.
- CBQ 28 McNamara, Martin. "Targumic Studies," Catholic  
Biblical Quarterly 28 (1966): 1-19.



- NTS 10 Mead, Richard T. "A Dissenting Opinion About Respect For Context In Old Testament Quotations," New Testament Studies 10 (1963-64): 279-89.
- JBL 70 Metzger, Bruce M. "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the New Testament and the Mishnah," Journal Of Biblical Literature 70 (1951): 297-307.
- NTS 8 ———. "Lucian And The Lucianic Recension Of The Greek Bible," New Testament Studies 8 (1961-62): 189-203.
- JBL 91 Miller, Gene. "APXONTΩN TOY AIΩNOΣ TOYTOY - A New Look At 1 Corinthians 2:6-8," Journal Of Biblical Literature 91 (1972): 522-28.
- JSJ 2 Miller, Merrill P. "Targum, Midrash And The Use Of The Old Testament In The New Testament," Journal For The Study Of Judaism 2 (1971): 29-82.
- RB 79 Morissette, Rodolphe. "Un Midrash Sur La Mort," Revue Biblique 79 (1972): 161-88.
- ET 78 Morton, A. Q. "Dislocations In 1 and 2 Corinthians," Expository Times 78 (1966-67): 119.
- NTS 14 Moule, C. F. D. "Fulfillment Words in the N. T.: Use and Abuse," New Testament Studies 14 (1968): 293-320.
- CBQ 18 Murphy, Roland E. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and New Testament Comparisons," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 18 (1956): 263-72.
- JSJ 4 Neusner, Jacob. "The Written Tradition In The Pre-Rabbinic Period," Journal For The Study Of Judaism 4 (1974): 56-65.
- ZNW 65 Nordheim, E. von. "Das Zitat Des Paulus In 1 Kor 2:9 Und Seine Beziehung Zum Koptischen Testament Jakobs," Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 65 (1974): 112-20.
- VT 23 Ohana, Moise. "Agneau Pascal Et Circoncision: Le Probleme De La Halakah Premishnaïque Dans Le Targum Palestinien," Vetus Testamentum 23 (1973): 385-99.



- Bib. 55 Ohana, Moise. "Prosélytisme et Targum Palestinien: Données Nouvelles Pour La Datation De Néofiti 1," Biblica 55 (1974): 317-32.
- JQR 66 Okamoto, Abraham O. H. "A Geonic Phrase In Ms. Targum Yerushalmi, Codex Neofiti I," Jewish Quarterly Review 66 (1976): 160-67.
- Bib. 20 Orchard, J. B. "Saint Paul and the Book of Daniel," Biblica 20 (1939): 172-79.
- JBL 78 Orlinsky, Harry M. "Qumran And The Present State Of Old Testament Studies: The Septuagint Text," Journal Of Biblical Literature 78 (1959): 26-33.
- BA 9 ———. "The Septuagint - Its Use In Textual Criticism," Biblical Archaeologist 9 (1946): 21-34.
- HUCA 35 ———. "Studies In The Septuagint Of The Book Of Job," Hebrew Union College Annual 35 (1964): 57-78.
- HUCA 27 ———. "The Treatment Of Anthropomorphisms And Anthropopathisms In The Septuagint Of Isaiah," Hebrew Union College Annual 27 (1956): 193-200.
- CT 9 Pinnock, C. H. "Review of Tradition and Transmission by Birger Gerhardsson," Christianity Today 9 no. 25 (1965): 28-29.
- TZ 14 Prigent, Pierre. "Ce que l'oeil n'a pas vu. I Cor. 2,9," Theologische Zeitschrift 14 (1958): 416-29.
- ZNW 20 Rahlfs, Alfred. "Über Theodotion-Lesarten im Neuen Testament und Aquila-Lesarten bei Justin," Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 20 (1921): 182-99.
- Ex 3 Ramsay, W. M. "St. Paul and the Jewish Christians in A. D. 46," Expositor 5th series 3 (1896): 174-90.
- EQ 36 Rendall, Robert. "Quotation In Scripture As An Index Of Wider Reference," Evangelical Quarterly 36 (1964): 214-21.

- EQ 45 Richardson, Peter. "Spirit And Letter: A Foundation for Hermeneutics," Evangelical Quarterly 45 (1973): 208-18.
- S 4 Ricoeur, Paul. "Biblical Hermeneutics," Semeia 4 (1975): 29-148.
- NTS 4 Rigaux, B. "Révélation Des Mystères Et Perfection A Qumran Et Dans Le Nouveau Testament," New Testament Studies 4 (1957-58): 237-62.
- BJRL 36 Roberts, Bledodyn J. "The Dead Sea Scrolls And The Old Testament Scriptures," Bulletin Of The John Rylands Library 36 (1953): 75-96.
- JBL 88 Roetzel, Calvin. "The Judgment Form In Paul's Letters," Journal Of Biblical Literature 88 (1969): 305-12.
- BJRL 44 Rowley, H. H. "The Qumran Sect and Christian Origins," Bulletin Of The John Rylands Library 44 (1961): 119-56.
- Jud. 7 Sahlin, Harald. "Der Neue Heilsexodus Bei Paulus," Judaica 7 (1952): 121-36.
- HTR 66 Sanders, E. P. "Patterns Of Religion In Paul And Rabbinic Judaism: A Holistic Method Of Comparison," Harvard Theological Review 66 (1973): 455-78.
- JR 39 Sanders, J. A. "Habakkuk in Qumran, Paul and the O. T.," Journal Of Religion 39 (1959): 232-44.
- JBL 81 Sandmel, Samuel. "Parallelomania," Journal Of Biblical Literature 81 (1962): 2-13.
- HUCA 15 ———. "Philo's Place In Judaism: A Study Of Conceptions Of Abraham In Jewish Literature," Hebrew Union College Annual 15 (1954): 209-37.
- RQ 8 Schiffman, Lawrence H. "The Qumran Law of Testimony," Revue De Qumran 8 (1975): 603-12.
- CBQ 29 Schneider, Barnardin. "The Corporate Meaning and Background of 1 Cor. 15:45b - 'O ESCHATOS ADAM EIS PNEUMA ZŌIOPOIOUN,'" Catholic Biblical Quarterly 29 (1967): 450-67.

- CBQ 15 Schneider, Barnardin. "The Meaning Of St. Paul's Antithesis 'The Letter And The Spirit'," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 15 (1953): 163-207.
- ZNW 49 Schulz, Siegfried. "'Die Decke Des Moses' Untersuchungen Zu Einer Vorpaulinischen Überlieferung In II Cor 3:7-18," Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 49 (1958): 1-30.
- JETS 15 Scott, J. J. "Paul and Late-Jewish Eschatology," Journal Of The Evangelical Theological Society 15 (1972): 133-43.
- NTS 14 Scroggs, Robin. "Paul: ΣΟΦΟΣ and ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΣ," New Testament Studies 14 (1967): 33-55.
- NTS 21 Sider, Ronald J. "The Pauline Conception Of The Resurrection Of The Body In I Corinthians XV. 35-54," New Testament Studies 21 (1975): 428-39.
- JBL 84 Silberman, Lou H. "Review of Tradition and Transmission by Birger Gerhardsson," Journal Of Biblical Literature 84 (1965): 459-60.
- RQ 3 ———. "Unriddling The Riddle," Revue De Qumran 3 (1961-62): 323-64.
- BA 28 Skehan, Patrick W. "The Biblical Scrolls From Qumran And The Text Of The Old Testament," Biblical Archaeologist 26 (1965): 87-100.
- JBL 78 ———. "Qumran And The Present State Of Old Testament Studies: The Masoretic Text," Journal Of Biblical Literature 78 (1959): 21-25.
- Bib. 48 Smith, Michael. "Another Criterion For The καί γε Recension," Biblica 48 (1967): 443-45.
- JBL 82 Smith, Morton. "A Comparison Of Early Christian And Early Rabbinic Tradition," Journal Of Biblical Literature 82 (1963): 169-76.
- BR 20 Snyder, Graydon F. "Sayings on the Delay of the End," Biblical Research 20 (1975): 19-35.

- HUCA 28 Soffer, Arthur. "The Treatment Of Anthropomorphisms And Anthropopathisms In The Septuagint of Psalms," Hebrew Union College Annual 28 (1957): 85-107.
- ZNW 67 Sparks, H. F. D. "1 Kor 2:9. A Quotation From The Coptic Testament Of Jacob?" Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 67 (1976): 268-76.
- JBL 59 Sperber, Alexander. "New Testament And Septuagint," Journal Of Biblical Literature 59 (1940): 193-293.
- JBL 54 ———. "The Problems Of The Septuagint Recensions," Journal Of Biblical Literature 54 (1935): 73-92.
- CBQ 23 Stanley, D. M. "Pauline Allusions To The Sayings Of Jesus," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 23 (1961): 26-39.
- ZWT 35& 36 Staerk, W. "Die Alttestamentlichen Citate Bei Den Schriftstellern Des Neuen Testaments," Zeitschrift Für Wissenschaftliche Theologie 35 (1892): 70-98.
- NTS 4 Suggs, M. J. "The Use Of Patristic Evidence In The Search For A Primitive New Testament Text," New Testament Studies 4 (1957-58): 139-47.
- NT 3 Sundberg, Albert C. "On Testimonies," Novum Testamentum 3 (1959): 268-81.
- NTS 13 Sweet, J. P. M. "A Sign For Unbelievers: Paul's Attitude To Glossolalia," New Testament Studies 13 (1966-67): 240-57.
- T 4 Talmon, Shemaryahu. "Aspects Of The Textual Transmission Of The Bible In The Light Of Qumran Manuscripts," Textus 4 (1964): 95-132.
- BS 11 Tholuck, A. G. "The Citations of the Old Testament in the New," ET Charles J. Aitken. Bibliotheca Sacra 11 (1854): 568-616.
- NTS 11 Thomas, Kenneth J. "The Old Testament Citations In Hebrews," New Testament Studies 11 (1964-65): 303-25.

- JTS 10 Thornhill, Raymond. "Six Or Seven Nations: A Pointer To The Lucianic Text In The Heptateuch, With Special Reference To The Old Latin Version," Journal Of Theological Studies, n.s. 10 (1959): 233-46.
- NTS 24 Thrall, Margaret E. "The Problem Of II Cor VI. 14-VII. 1 In Some Recent Discussion," New Testament Studies 24 (1977): 132-48.
- RB 79 Tov, Emanuel. "Lucian And Proto-Lucian," Revue Biblique 79 (1972): 101-13.
- HTR 61 Townsend, John T. "1 Cor. 3:15 and the School of Shammai," Harvard Theological Review 61 (1968): 500-04.
- RQ 2 Treves, Marco. "On The Meaning Of The Qumran Testimonia," Revue De Qumran 2 (1960): 569-71.
- SJT 28 Turner, Geoffrey. "Pre-Understanding And New Testament Interpretation," Scottish Journal Of Theology 28 (1975): 227-42.
- NT 6 Van Unnik, W. C. "With Unveiled Face: An Exegesis of II Corinthians III 12-18," Novum Testamentum 6 (1963): 153-69.
- Int. 28 Via, Dan O. "A Structuralist Approach To Paul's Old Testament Hermeneutic," Interpretation 28 (1974): 201-20.
- NTS 21 Vielhauer, Philipp. "Paulus Und Die Kephaspartei In Korinth," New Testament Studies 21 (1975): 341-52.
- HUCA 30 Wacholder, Ben Zion. "The Date Of The Mekilta De-Rabbi Ishmael," Hebrew Union College Annual 30 (1968): 117-44.
- ZNW 64 Wedderburn, A. J. M. "ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ - 1 Kor 1:21," Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 64 (1973): 132-34.
- NT 15 ———. "Philo's 'Heavenly Man'," Novum Testamentum 15 (1973): 301-26.

- VT 12 Wernberg-Møller, P. "An Inquiry Into The Validity Of The Text-Critical Argument For An Early Dating Of The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum," Vetus Testamentum 12 (1962): 312-30.
- JR 24 Wikgren, Allen. "The Targums And The New Testament," Journal Of Religion 24 (1944): 89-95.
- ZNW 59 Wilson, Jack H. "The Corinthians Who Say There Is No Resurrection Of The Dead," Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 59 (1968): 90-107.
- ZAW 44 & 45 Windfuhr, D. "Der Apostel Paulus Als Haggadist," Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 44-45 (1926-27): 327-30.
- CBQ 38 Wittstruck, Thorne. "The So-Called Anti-Anthropomorphisms In The Greek Text Of Deuteronomy," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 38 (1976): 29-34.
- CBQ 28 Wright, Addison G. "The Literary Genre Midrash," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 28 (1966): 105-38; 417-57.
- JBL 89 Wuellner, Wilhelm. "Haggadic Homily Genre in I Corinthians 1-3," Journal Of Biblical Literature 89 (1970): 199-204.
- JSJ 5 York, Anthony D. "The Dating Of Targumic Literature," Journal For The Study Of Judaism 5 (1974): 49-62.
- JBL 78 Ziegler, Joseph. "Die Vorlage Der Isaias-Septuaginta (LXX) Und Die Erste Isaias-Rolle Von Qumran (1QIs<sup>a</sup>)," Journal Of Biblical Literature 78 (1959): 34-59.
- JQR 66 Zeitlin, Solomon. "Dreams And Their Interpretation From The Biblical Period To The Tannaitic Time: An Historical Study," Jewish Quarterly Review 66 (1975): 1-18.

## UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- SJ           Addley, W. P. "The Sayings Of Jesus In The Epistles Of St. Paul." M. Th. Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1971.
- Brock, Sebastian. Personal letter, April 6, 1977.
- UOT          Garrison, James A. "Certain Aspects Of The Use Of The Old Testament In The Epistle Of Paul To The Romans." Ph. D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 1970.
- OTTT        Marbury, Carl Harris. "Old Testament Textual Traditions In The New Testament: Studies In Text-Types." Ph. D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1968.
- LXXH        Thomas, Kenneth John. "The Use Of The Septuagint In The Epistle To The Hebrews." Ph. D. dissertation, University of Manchester, 1959.
- FAZA        Ulonska, Herbert. "Die Funktion Der Alttestamentlichen Zitate Und Anspielungen In Den Paulinischen Briefen." Ph. D. dissertation, University of Münster, 1963.
- ST          Wantock, Willis W. "Speaking In Tongues In First Corinthians." Th. M. thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1970.